

Mr. McNARY. I think I can explain the situation to the Senator. It is quite essential to make available at once the entire appropriation for roads, so that binding contracts can be made for the construction and improvement of roads. It can not be done until we pass the bill, and I think the bill can be passed in at least two hours.

Mr. SWANSON. If we make the appropriations for those roads, the money will be available in the next fiscal year. It will not be available until after the 1st of July. If I can get an understanding that the public buildings bill will be taken up and considered ahead of that bill, so as to facilitate its passage, I shall have no objection; but we have been standing aside here now for three or four months waiting for the public-buildings bill to be reported and considered. That bill is merely an authorization measure and it will be necessary, after its passage, to have estimates made and then appropriations made for the public buildings. We will have to wait several months before estimates can be made in the different cities and towns and submitted to the Budget Bureau and then sent to the Congress. It is one of the most important matters pending before the Congress. If we are going to give work to the unemployed, here is the best opportunity to do it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana had the floor and now regains it.

Mr. McNARY. I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Indiana had the floor and yielded to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WATSON. I yield again to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. The point I am making is that when the bill is passed, although the money is made available on the 30th day of June, in the meantime and instantly contracts can be made based upon the appropriation for the construction of roads.

Mr. SWANSON. Oh, no; the contracts can not be made until the money is available.

Mr. McNARY. I know it can be done, because it has been done in the past.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the Senator from Virginia to let me go along with the program. It is looked upon as a practical one, and I think we will be able to pass the bill in a short time.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know what the program is. I know I have been waiting here for three or four months, hoping that the public buildings bill which the President has urged might be passed, but we have been unable to get any consideration of it.

Mr. WATSON. I know what the program is, as I understand it.

Mr. SWANSON. Then I will ask the Senator to state it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the House passed the public buildings bill with virtually no opposition at all; in fact, almost unanimously. The Senate committee considered it and without delay unanimously reported it to the Senate, but the desire on the part of every Senator interested in the tariff bill to dispose of that measure caused consideration of the public buildings bill to be deferred from day to day. It was understood, however, that we would take it up immediately after the tariff bill was concluded. I think the Senator from Virginia is perfectly safe in letting it go to follow immediately after the bill in charge of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I make the suggestion that, immediately after conclusion of the agricultural bill, if it should be temporarily laid aside, or if, for any reason, its consideration is not proceeded with, the public buildings bill be allowed to come up.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am not going to agree to parceling out the time now. I should like to suggest a program to the Senator from Indiana, if he will permit me.

Mr. WATSON. I myself have one to suggest, if I ever have a chance to make the suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator would not yield to everybody, he would have a chance to state it.

Mr. WATSON. I want to hear what everyone has to say.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is going to hear from everybody else, I think he ought to hear from me.

Mr. WATSON. I will speak in my own right now, Mr. President. What we really wanted to do when it became evident that there was great pressure for the passage of these three bills, the deficiency bill, which we have disposed of, the public buildings bill, and the agricultural appropriation bill, was to permit the deficiency appropriation bill to be passed this afternoon, which has been accomplished, and then to adjourn until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, pass the agricultural appropriation bill in the morning hour, and then proceed to consider and dispose of the public buildings bill.

Mr. SWANSON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Nebraska and I agreed, when it was understood that we were to make the Muscle Shoals bill the unfinished business, that that would be the program; and I know of no reason why it should not be carried out.

Mr. NORRIS. I have made no agreement to lay aside the unfinished business for anything except appropriation bills and conference reports; but if the Senator will agree to have the Senate adjourn, so that we will have a morning hour, which we ought to have, and let Senators sleep over these matters, we will come here to-morrow and before 2 o'clock we will iron them out.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, does the Senator know of any reason why the agricultural bill could not be passed even before we took an adjournment this evening?

Mr. WATSON. The only difficulty is that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], in charge of the bill, has said that it will take probably a couple of hours, and I thought the Senate would not want to remain here that long. We certainly can pass that bill to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH. Very well.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, March 24, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With the thought of Thee, our Heavenly Father, our natures feel the sense of infinity; it deepens and amplifies them in moral and spiritual ways. Bring us to the full consciousness that life is infinitely more than existence. We live in thoughts, in emotions, and in deeds. O give us the purer outlook and the broader view; then we shall be in possession of a more glorious and enlarging hope. Bless us with the abiding secret of a good life. May we assimilate the divine, drink in its truth, and join Thee in the good work of mercy and help. With Thee, O Lord, there is fullness of wisdom, and our highest good is bound up in obedience to it in our daily lives. Blessed Father of mercy, hear our prayer and lighten our eyes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 21, 1930, was read and approved.

REAL ESTATE BROKERS' BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, to file minority views on the bill H. R. 10476, the real estate brokers' bill, a majority report having been filed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to file minority views on the bill H. R. 10476. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

Mr. FENN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of the House to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Starkey, H. R. 14144, second session, Sixty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made.

PROTEST FROM THE OMAHA INDIAN TRIBAL COUNCIL AGAINST PASSAGE OF THE JOHNSON-SWING BILL

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating therein a plea to the Congress by my Omaha Indian Tribal Council.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incor-

porating a plea from the Omaha Indian Tribal Council. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The petition is as follows:

*The Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:*

MACY, NERR., March 14, 1930.

We understand that a bill to place jurisdiction over the Indian wards of the Nation within the power of the several States, in which such tribes may reside, has been introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHNSON, and in the House by Mr. SWING, of California, and

We, as representatives of the Omaha Tribe of Indians, residing in the State of Nebraska, do hereby enter our objection thereto.

While we realize that the Indian question is difficult, we conclude that the President, through his subordinates, will be better able to administer their affairs than the commercial interests of the several States.

The state of conditions to-day has drifted far away from the fundamental impulses which guided the builders of the Nation. There is yet a far greater closeness to that impulse in the National Government than there is in the administration of the several States.

To transfer the administration of Indian affairs to the States would mean leveling their administration to the cold, calculated manipulation of pure business, where the rights of a small entity must give way to the will of the powerful.

It would become a political football, in that it would be the basis of commercial rights and privileges.

It would subject the inalienable rights of the wards to the cold scrutiny of indifferent laws, having no compassionate sympathy for the original policy of the National Government.

The Indian policy has always been a national duty, with which alone the National Congress is familiar. To transfer their affairs to the States would mean to hand it over to bodies which have no relation to this original policy, know and feel nothing of it, and acting foreign from it.

We therefore respectfully urge the Congress to reject this proposed legislation and simply purge the Indian Bureau of those who have strayed from the influence of those great men of the past who gave this Nation life, power, and world-wide respect.

Respectfully,

THE OMAHA TRIBAL COUNCIL,
By ELWOOD HARLAN, Secretary.
EDWARD CLINE.
THOS. F. WALKER.
JAMES FREMONT.
JOHN KEMP.
JOHN GRANT.
HENRY SHERIDAN.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Andresen	Dickinson	Kunz	Sproul, Kans.
Bacon	Dickstein	Kurtz	Stedman
Bankhead	Dominick	Lampert	Sullivan, N. Y.
Beedy	Doughton	Lanham	Sullivan, Pa.
Black	Douglass, Mass.	Lankford, Va.	Summers, Tex.
Blackburn	Doyle	Lee, Tex.	Swing
Boylan	Drewry	McCormick, Ill.	Taylor, Colo.
Britten	Edwards	Manlove	Tilson
Browne	Gasque	Michaelson	Tucker
Buckbee	Golder	Miller	Turpin
Carley	Goldsborough	Nelson, Me.	Underwood
Celler	Graham	O'Connor, N. Y.	Vestal
Chase	Griffin	Oliver, N. Y.	Vincent, Mich.
Chindblom	Hammer	Pratt, Ruth	Vinson, Ga.
Clark, N. C.	Hudspeth	Quayle	Walker
Coyle	Igoe	Reed, N. Y.	White
Craddock	James	Reid, Ill.	Whitehead
Culkin	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath	Wright
Curry	Jonas, N. C.	Scars	Wurzbach
Dallinger	Kelly	Seiberling	Wyant
Dempsey	Knutson	Sirovich	Yates
De Priest	Korell	Somers, N. Y.	Zihlman

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAPES). Three hundred and forty-five Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. SNELL, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 11045

A bill to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building

Be it enacted, etc., The appropriation "House Office Building," contained in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, is hereby made available for the payment of not to exceed \$1,077,745.74 for the acquisition of such site notwithstanding the limit of cost for site named in such appropriation and in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a fireproof office building or buildings for the House of Representatives," approved January 10, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will say a word or two in explanation of the bill. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Office Building Commission and with the approval of my colleagues, I have introduced this bill and asked its consideration at this time, and I am pleased that such a large number of the Members of the House are present.

The House Office Building Commission, as you know, consists of three Members, myself, as chairman, by virtue of my office as Speaker; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GAERNER], by virtue of his office as minority leader; and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH], on account of his individual fitness for the position.

We have arrived at the stage where we must have authority of the House for the expenditure of more money than was originally authorized. The House Office Building Commission has a two-fold duty—one, to manage the present House Office Building and the other to acquire the land necessary and to erect thereon a building for the new House Office Building.

In Public Act 648 of the Seventieth Congress, on January 10, 1929, authorization was approved for the site and the construction of a new House Office Building. The limit of cost was fixed at \$8,400,000, of which \$900,000 was designated as the amount for the site and \$7,500,000 as the cost of the building.

Under the urgent deficiency bill of the Seventieth Congress, on March 4, 1929, there was appropriated toward the construction and site the sum of \$2,100,000. In other words, for the commencement of the building and for the acquisition of the necessary land, there is now in the Treasury \$2,100,000. The authorization for the acquisition of the land was only \$900,000. The land can not be purchased, either by private negotiation or by condemnation, for that sum.

The \$900,000 originally was based on the theory that the fair value for the land would be about 65 per cent more than the assessed value, but we found that either by private negotiation, by which most of the land was acquired, or by condemnation, that sum would have to be exceeded, as provided in this bill, by \$177,000, in round numbers. In other words, the total amount necessary for the acquisition of this land, the two squares immediately south of us facing on B Street and extending back to C Street, is \$1,077,745.74. This is the lowest figure at which the land can be acquired. We had hoped to be able to acquire all of the land by private negotiation. We only succeeded in acquiring two lots, one, a small lot known as the Diggs property, for \$2,795, and the second, the large and most important piece of ground, which covered practically a square, the Congress Hall Hotel property, for \$733,000, approximately.

The two frontages just immediately south of us on B Street belong to the Government. Therefore there was no cost attached to that.

We had detailed negotiations with the owners of the Congress Hall Hotel property, who asked considerably more than they finally agreed to accept, but the \$733,087.41 is 86.25 per cent more than the assessed value.

The other piece which we acquired was about 65 per cent more than the assessed value.

We found we could go no further by private transaction, so we asked the Department of Justice to bring condemnation proceedings. The condemnation jury award was handed down a few days ago, and the amount allowed by the jury for all the property acquired by condemnation was one hundred and twenty-seven and a fraction per cent more than the assessed value of the property. While we do not particularly boast of the transaction which we made as a commission, at least we got by with 86.25 per cent for Congress Hall Hotel property and 65 per cent for the Diggs property; and the jury of condemnation awarded 127 per cent more than the assessed valuation for the rest.

I am not prepared to say whether this award is excessive or not, but it does seem to be the fact that whenever the Government desires to acquire land in the District of Columbia and brings condemnation proceedings, juries invariably give more than 100 per cent above the assessed valuation.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I gladly yield.

Mr. GARNER. If we had not bought the Congress Hall Hotel property for \$733,000, which I thought was too much and yet believe is more than the property was worth, but had condemned it on the same basis, we would probably have had to pay \$900,000 for it?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think we would have been fortunate to get by with \$900,000. The fact is that every time the Government acquires land in the District of Columbia by condemnation proceedings, juries invariably give more than twice the assessed valuation.

I am not prepared to paraphrase Hamlet and apply what he said to the District of Columbia so far as assessments or condemnations are concerned, but the fact is that the award for the Supreme Court site, acquired by condemnation, was something more than 100 per cent above the assessed value. The sites for the Senate and House Office Buildings were acquired some years ago by condemnation and the juries awarded more than 100 per cent above the assessed value.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. GARNER. My opinion is that the Judiciary Committee of the House—and I make this statement so that the members of that committee may have the suggestion in mind—should give consideration to the question of providing a different method of condemnation proceeding in the District of Columbia. [Applause.] I do not know just how far they can go under the Constitution in lodging the power to condemn property for public purposes in the Supreme Court of the District, but some other method surely ought to be arranged rather than to continue the method we now have, because in some instances I think it is absolutely legal robbery of the Government, when we take into consideration the amount the juries permit in these condemnation proceedings. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Personally I can see no reason why the method of empanelling a jury for the purpose of assessing the value of lands should be different from any other proceeding; in other words, that an ordinary jury should be called upon to determine the value of land instead of empanelling a jury of five, as is the case under the law as it now exists.

Mr. GARNER. And specially selected.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And specially selected, and possibly, although I do not make the definite statement, the same gentlemen serve on a number of juries. I do not know that to be the fact, but the fact is it is impossible for us to proceed with the acquisition of the land necessary to erect this House Office Building by virtue of the fact that the juries have assessed double the value which we originally thought would be a fair amount, namely, about 65 per cent above the assessed value of the property.

We are now asking you to authorize an additional appropriation, in round numbers, \$177,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman tell us just which property it is that the jury has condemned for this amount of money?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The Potomac Hotel, for one, which is a small lot, 8,997 square feet, and for that small lot and improvements the jury awarded \$173,592.15, which is 127 per cent more than the assessed value of the property.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. GARNER. My recollection is that in discussing this matter with the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Lynn, he told us that this valuation would rebuild the Potomac Hotel brand new.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It would build a little Mayflower Hotel in place of the present Potomac Hotel.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What does the law require in regard to assessing property—what percentage of the value? Is it assessed 50 per cent or 100 per cent of its market value?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is presumed to be assessed at full value, as I understand it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I was under the impression it was two-thirds for taxation purposes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I believe not.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LUCE. The Record should also show that precisely the same state of affairs exists in regard to the attempt to acquire land for the new arboretum, for the site of the new Botanic Gardens, and for the extension of the new building for the Library.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have no question that statement is correct. I think it is absolutely safe to say that whenever the Government of the United States wants to acquire land in the District of Columbia for governmental purposes and is forced to institute condemnation proceedings, it will have to pay not less than twice the value of the land; that is say, its assessed value for taxation purposes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman mean twice the value of the land assessed for taxation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then, does not the gentleman think it is fair to assume that the land is assessed too low for taxation purposes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, it is one or the other horn of the dilemma. Either the land is assessed too low or the jury values it too highly, and it might be a compromise between the two.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will state that a few years ago I had occasion to investigate quite a number of assessments here in the city and I found them all to be pretty fair assessments, higher than lands are assessed in the State in which I live, in proportion to real value.

Mr. LONGWORTH. While I do not want to burden you with details I might read the exact figures in connection with the purchase of this entire property.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. It is understood, is it not, that the building to be erected is for the upper House of Congress?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Absolutely. [Laughter and applause.] We have not under consideration any appropriations for the lower House.

Mr. BUSBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BUSBY. I want to say that I was at the District Building last week and I learned, while at the tax assessor's office, that people who have lands within an area where the Government proposes to take over property go down there and clamor for a larger assessment of their property, and raise a lot of noise around the tax assessor's office because their property is not assessed high enough. They say that is a common thing in the tax assessor's office.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As I stated, the amount which we are authorized to expend was \$900,000, on the theory that this land could be acquired for about 65 per cent more than the assessed value.

Mr. GARNER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. GARNER. So the House may understand in case we have to come back for an increased appropriation. The owners of the Potomac Hotel, or, rather, the agent of the Potomac Hotel, has asked for a conference with the House commission with a view of asking more money than the court has allowed them, although it is 127 plus per cent higher than the assessed value of the property. Now, if they should appeal that case and the court should on appeal give them additional money, we would have to come back and ask for more money than the court has allowed under the condemnation proceedings which have already been had.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As the gentleman from Texas states, the owners have asked for a hearing before the House Office Building Commission, which has been refused. We will take our chances that the next jury will not give them more than 127 per cent in excess of the assessed value.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Can the gentleman state how much was allowed in the amount awarded by the jury for good will and loss of business, or were the items separated?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think not. I think it was a lump sum. The owners of the Potomac Hotel originally asked \$275,000 for the property, which was 260.92 per cent above the assessed valuation. We bargained with them for some time, but were unable to reach any satisfactory agreement.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question that has just been suggested by some of the Members?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER. I understood from Mr. Lynn that if this bill should become a law and the property could be acquired within the next 10 or 15 days so that he could go ahead with the plans

for removing the building, the building could be completed within two years from to-day.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is the statement made by the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. GARNER. So the membership of the Seventy-second Congress would be able to move into the building the next November.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And not only that, but if we can proceed shortly with the erection of the building it would not be surprising if it could be built for quite a substantial sum less than the amount authorized.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. BECK. Would it not be practicable to take possession of this land by paying the money into court and then appeal from this unconscionable award?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That could be done; but then we would have to wait, perhaps, for some time before the courts finally passed upon it.

Mr. BECK. But if we took possession by paying the money into court, subject to the appeal, we would have possession. We could not fare any worse. I do not myself know what the provision for an appeal is, but I suppose there must be some method of appeal from the award of this special jury.

Mr. LONGWORTH. An appeal may be taken by the owners of the Potomac Hotel on the ground the court award is not high enough.

Mr. BECK. But not by the Government?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think not, although I would not be positive. It seems to us the best thing to do is to accept the situation as it is and ask the House to authorize us to expend \$177,000 more than was originally authorized.

I will put some of the figures I have here in the RECORD, but I think it would be boring you with details if I stated now the number of lots, and so forth.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. UNDERHILL. In view of the fact that we are about to consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill and that every year when we consider this bill the newspapers of the District criticize Congress for its niggardly policy in appropriating only \$9,000,000 toward the conduct of the business of the District as the appropriation of the Government, would it not be a good idea to embody in the RECORD or in the bill itself a provision that when the Government acquires property the cost, over the assessed valuation, shall be deducted from the amount carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill? [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Unless some Member desires further information, I will ask for a vote on the bill.

I append the complete figures of the cost of acquisition of the land in the two squares:

Memorandum for House Office Building site

Amount appropriated for the two squares.....	\$900,000.00
Square 689, private sale, Congress Hall Hotel.....	\$733,087.41
Square 636, private sale, Diggs property.....	\$2,795.10
Total private sale of both squares.....	\$735,882.51
Balance for site, left from appropriation.....	\$164,117.49
Award of court for both squares.....	\$341,863.23
Amount necessary for deficiency appropriation.....	\$177,745.74
Amount paid for Potomac Hotel in square 689 (court award).....	\$173,592.15
Percentage paid Potomac Hotel above assessed value, per cent.....	127.82
Amount paid for Congress Hall Hotel, private sale.....	\$733,087.41
Percentage paid for Congress Hall Hotel above assessed value, per cent.....	86.25
Amount of court award for Potomac Hotel above amount allowed by House Office Building Commission.....	\$31,630.83
Total assessed value of both squares.....	\$545,029.00
Total awards for both squares.....	\$1,077,745.74
Percentage above assessed values for both squares allowed by private sale and court awards, per cent.....	87.74
Total paid for square 636.....	\$171,066.14
Total paid for square 689.....	\$906,679.00
Total to be paid for both.....	\$1,077,745.74
Percentage paid above assessed value for square 636, per cent.....	127.38
Total award, both squares.....	\$341,863.23
Total award, Potomac 689.....	173,592.15
Total award, 636.....	\$168,271.08

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF MOTOR-BUS CARRIERS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 10288) to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the bill as amended appear in the RECORD at this point?

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily, the third reading is merely by title.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not care to take up the time of the House to have it read, but I ask unanimous consent that the bill be inserted in the RECORD in full.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time.

The bill is as follows:

H. R. 10288

An act to regulate the transportation of persons in interstate and foreign commerce by motor carriers operating on the public highways

Be it enacted, etc.,

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "corporation" means a corporation, company, association, or joint-stock association.

(2) The term "person" means an individual, firm, or copartnership.

(3) The term "board" or "State board" means the commission, board, or official (by whatever name designated in the laws of a State) which, under the laws of any State in which any part of the service in interstate or foreign commerce regulated by this act is to be performed, has or may hereafter have jurisdiction to grant or approve certificates of public convenience and necessity or other form of permit to motor-vehicle common carriers in intrastate commerce over the public highways of such State.

(4) The term "commission" means the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(5) The term "certificate" means a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under this act.

(6) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between any place in a State and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State but through any place outside thereof.

(7) The term "public highway" includes the public roads, highways, streets, and ways in any State.

(8) The term "motor vehicle" means all vehicles or machines propelled by any power other than muscular power and used upon the public highways for the transportation of persons, except that the same shall not include any vehicle, locomotive, or car operated on a rail or rails, or motor vehicles used exclusively in the transportation of property.

(9) The term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

(10) The term "common carrier by motor vehicle" means any common carriers of persons operating motor vehicles for compensation in interstate or foreign commerce over fixed routes or between fixed termini.

(11) The term "charter carrier by motor vehicle" means any carrier of persons operating motor vehicles for compensation in interstate or foreign commerce other than those included in paragraphs (a) (10) and (b) of this section.

(12) The term "motor carrier" includes both a common carrier by motor vehicle and a charter carrier by motor vehicle.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to include (1) motor vehicles employed solely in transporting school children and teachers; or (2) taxicabs, or other motor vehicles performing a similar service, having a capacity of not more than six passengers and not operated on a regular route or between fixed termini; or (3) motor vehicles owned or operated by or on behalf of hotels and used exclusively for the transportation of hotel patrons between hotels and local railroad or other common carrier stations.

GENERAL DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the commission—

(1) To supervise and regulate common carriers by motor vehicle as provided in this act, and to that end the commission may establish reasonable requirements with respect to continuous and adequate service at just and reasonable rates, a uniform system of accounts and reports, qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees, safety of operation and equipment, comfort of passengers, and pick-up and delivery points whether on regular routes or within defined localities or districts;

(2) To supervise and regulate charter carriers by motor vehicle as provided in this act, and to that end the commission may establish reasonable requirements with respect to qualifications and maximum hours of service of employees, safety of operation and equipment, and comfort of passengers; and

(3) To prescribe rules and regulations for the proper administration of this act.

(b) Any person, corporation, or State board may make complaint in writing to the commission alleging a failure by any motor carrier to comply with the requirements established under this section. If, after any such complaint, it is decided, in accordance with the procedure provided in section 3, that the motor carrier has failed to comply with such requirements, an appropriate order shall be issued.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

SEC. 3. (a) Except in case of a matter required to be referred to a joint board as provided in subdivision (d), any particular matter or class of matters arising under the administration of this act may be heard and decided by the commission, or may, by order of the commission, be referred for hearing to any member or examiner of the commission. Such member or examiner shall hear and decide the matter referred and recommend appropriate order thereon. With respect to such matter the member or examiner shall have all the rights, duties, powers, and jurisdiction conferred by this act upon the commission, except the power to make the final order thereon. Any order recommended by the member or examiner with respect to such matter shall be filed with the commission and shall, upon the expiration of 10 days after filing, become the order of the commission and become effective, unless within such period the order is stayed or postponed by the commission. An application in writing for the review of any such matter may be made to the commission, whereupon it shall be its duty to consider the same and, if sufficient reason appears therefor, grant such review or make such orders or hold or authorize such further hearings or proceedings in the premises as may be necessary or proper to carry out the purposes of this act; or the commission may, on its own motion, review any such matter and take action thereon as if the application therefor had been made by an interested party. The commission after review shall decide the matter and make appropriate order thereon.

(b) Hearings by any member or examiner upon any matter referred to him shall be held at such convenient places within the United States as the commission may by rule or order direct.

(c) Whenever there arises under the administration of this act any matter that the commission is required to refer to a joint board, or that the commission determines, in its discretion, to refer to a joint board, as hereinafter provided, the commission shall create a joint board to consider and decide such matter, under such rules governing meetings and procedure of joint boards as the commission shall prescribe. Such joint board shall consist of a member from each State in which the motor-carrier operations involved in the matter are or are proposed to be conducted. The member from any such State shall be nominated by the board of such State from its own membership or otherwise; or if there is no board in such State or if the board of such State fails to make a nomination when requested by the commission, then the governor of such State may nominate such member. The commission is authorized to appoint as a member upon the joint board any such nominee approved by it. All decisions and recommendations by joint boards shall be by majority vote. If the board of each State from which a member of a joint board is entitled to be appointed shall waive action on any matter referred to such joint board, or if any joint board fails or refuses to act or is unable to agree upon any matter submitted to it, or if both the board and governor of any State fail to nominate a joint board member when requested by the commission, then such matter shall be heard and decided as in the case of any matter not required to be referred to a joint board. Joint boards when administering the provisions of this act shall be agencies of the Federal Government, and members thereof shall receive such allowances for expenses as the commission shall provide.

(d) The commission shall, when operations of common carriers by motor vehicle conducted or proposed to be conducted involve not more than three States, and the commission may, in its discretion, when operations of common carriers by motor vehicle conducted or proposed to be conducted involve more than three States, refer to a joint board for hearing and decision and recommendation of appropriate order thereon, any of the following matters arising under the administration of this act with respect to such operations: Applications for the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity (except in so far as the action upon such applications is based solely upon answers to questionnaires and information furnished to the commission, as provided in section 5 (b)); the suspension, change, or revocation of such certificates; applications for the approval and authorization of consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions of control; complaints as to violations by common carriers by motor vehicle of the requirements established under section 2. (a) (1); complaints as to rates, fares, and charges of common carriers by motor vehicle; and the approval of surety bonds, policies of insurance, or other securities or agreements for the protection of the public, required on the issuance of a certificate application for which is referred to a joint board. In acting upon matters so referred, joint boards shall be vested with the same rights, duties, powers, and jurisdiction as are vested hereinbefore in this section in members or examiners of the commission while acting under its orders in the administration of this act. Orders recommended by joint boards shall be filed with the commission, and shall become orders of the com-

mission and become effective and shall be subject to review by the commission, in the same manner as provided in the case of members or examiners under this section.

(e) In so far as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, the commission and the members and examiners thereof and joint boards shall have the same power to administer oaths and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, tariffs, contracts, agreements, and documents, and to take testimony by deposition, relating to any matter under investigation, as though such matter arose under the interstate commerce act, as amended and supplemented; and any person subpoenaed or testifying in connection with any matter under investigation under this act shall have the same rights, privileges, and immunities and be subject to the same duties, liabilities, and penalties as are provided in the interstate commerce act, as amended and supplemented.

(f) In accordance with rules prescribed by the commission, reasonable notice shall be afforded in connection with any proceeding under this act to all parties of record and to the governor and the board of any State in which the carrier operations involved in the proceeding are or are proposed to be conducted, and opportunity for hearing and for intervention in connection with any such proceeding shall be afforded to all interested parties.

(g) The commission is authorized to confer with and/or to hold joint hearings with any authorities of any State in connection with any matter arising in any proceeding under this act. The commission is also authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records, and facilities of any State, or any officials thereof, in the enforcement of any provision of this act.

(h) Any final order made under this act shall be subject to the same right of relief in court by any party in interest as is now provided in respect to orders of the commission made under the interstate commerce act, as amended.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

SEC. 4. (a) No corporation or person shall operate as a common carrier by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce on any public highway unless there is in force with respect to such carrier a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing such operation: *Provided*, That any common carrier by motor vehicle in operation on the date of the approval of this act may continue such operation for a period of 90 days thereafter without any such certificate, and if application for a certificate authorizing such operation is made to the commission within such period the carrier may, under such regulations as the commission may prescribe, continue such operation until otherwise ordered by the commission.

(b) Applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity shall be made in writing to the commission, be verified under oath, and be in such form and contain such information as the commission shall require.

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), a certificate of public convenience and necessity shall be issued to any applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the operations covered by the application, if it is found that the public convenience and necessity will be served by the operations authorized.

(b) If the corporation or person making application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity sets forth therein that it or any predecessor in interest was operating as a common carrier by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce on any public highway on March 1, 1930, and claims the benefits of this subsection, the commission upon receipt of such application shall serve such carrier with a questionnaire in respect to the matters on which the commission may require information. The applicant shall answer the questionnaire within 45 days from the receipt thereof. A copy of all questionnaires and answers thereto shall be furnished by the commission to the board of every State in which any part of the operations of the carrier are conducted. If it appears from the answers to the questionnaire or from information otherwise furnished, (1) that the carrier or a predecessor in interest was in bona fide operation on March 1, 1930, as a common carrier by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce on any public highway and (except as to interruption of operations over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest had no control) continuously has so operated since that date, and (2) that such operations are bona fide for the purpose of furnishing reasonably continuous and adequate service at just and reasonable rates, and (3) that the applicant is fit and able properly to perform the service required, then a certificate shall be issued to the applicant by the commission without further proceedings; otherwise, the question whether or not such facts appear shall be decided in accordance with the procedure provided in section 3 (including reference to a joint board in a proper case), and the certificate under this subsection shall be issued or denied accordingly. For the purposes of this subsection a common carrier by motor vehicle furnishing seasonal service shall be deemed to qualify under clause (1) if such carrier or a predecessor in interest was in bona fide operation as a common carrier by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce for the calendar year 1929 during the season ordinarily covered by its

operations, and (except as to interruption of operations over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest had no control) has so operated continuously during each such season thereafter.

(c) Nothing contained in section 500 of the transportation act, 1920, shall be construed as expressing a preference by Congress for rail or water transportation over transportation by motor vehicle or to affect in any manner the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity under the provisions of this act; and nothing contained in this act shall be construed as a declaration by Congress of the relative importance to the public of the several kinds of transportation.

(d) No certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under this act shall be construed as conferring any proprietary or exclusive rights in the public highways.

(e) In the administration of this act the commission shall, so far as is consistent with the public interest, preserve competition in service.

(f) If it appears at any time that motor-vehicle service in interstate or foreign commerce on any public highway is alone carried on by a railroad company, or alone by persons or corporations owning an interest in a railroad company, the commission shall give consideration to the issuance of a further certificate to a common carrier by motor vehicle on such highway, if applied for by any person or corporation not interested in a railroad company and shown to be qualified to meet the rules, requirements, and conditions fixed by the commission for such service.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CERTIFICATE

SEC. 6. (a) Any certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under any provision of section 5 shall specify the routes over which and/or the fixed termini between which the carrier is authorized to operate; and there shall at the time of issuance and from time to time thereafter be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by the certificate such reasonable terms and conditions as the public convenience and necessity may from time to time require, including terms and conditions as to the furnishing of additional service over the specified routes or between the specified termini, and the extension of the line or lines of the carrier, and such terms and conditions as are necessary to carry out, with respect to the operations of the carrier, the requirements established by the commission under section 2 (a) (1).

(b) A common carrier by motor vehicle operating under any such certificate may occasionally deviate from the route over which or the fixed termini between which it is authorized to operate under the certificate for the purpose of providing special service, in accordance with such rules, regulations, and orders as the commission may prescribe or make.

PERMITS FOR CHARTER CARRIERS

SEC. 7. (a) No corporation or person shall operate as a charter carrier by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce on any public highway or within any park or reservation under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States unless there is in force with respect to such carrier a charter carrier permit, issued by the commission, authorizing such operation; except that any charter carrier by motor vehicle in operation on the date of the approval of this act may continue such operation for a period of 90 days thereafter without a charter carrier permit, and if application for a permit authorizing such operation is made to the commission within such period the carrier may, under such regulations as the commission may prescribe, continue such operations until otherwise ordered by the commission.

(b) Applications for such permits shall be made to the commission in writing, certified under oath, and shall contain such information as the commission may require. If it appears that the applicant is fit and able properly to perform the service proposed, then a charter carrier permit shall be issued to the applicant by the commission. The commission shall specify in the permit the operations covered thereby, so far as practicable, and shall attach to the permit, at the time of issuance and from time to time thereafter, reasonable limitations in respect to service while operating over any regular route of a common carrier by motor vehicle, and such terms and conditions as are necessary to carry out, with respect to the operations of such carrier, the requirements established by the commission under section 2 (a) (2).

SUSPENSION, CHANGE, REVOCATION, AND TRANSFER OF CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS

SEC. 8. (a) Certificates of public convenience and necessity, and charter carrier permits, shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until terminated as herein provided. Any such certificate or permit may be suspended, changed, or revoked, in whole or in part, for failure to comply with any provision of this act, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term or condition of the certificate or permit, or whenever the public interest shall so require.

(b) Except as provided in section 9, any such certificate or permit shall be transferable.

CONSOLIDATION, MERGER, AND ACQUISITION OF CONTROL

SEC. 9. (a) Any corporate consolidation or merger of two or more corporations at least one of which is a common carrier by motor vehicle, and any acquisition of control of any common carrier by motor vehicle,

shall be invalid and unlawful unless approved and authorized as hereinafter provided. For the purposes of this section, control of any common carrier by motor vehicle shall be deemed to be acquired if any person or corporation acquires (except pursuant to court order or by operation of law), directly or indirectly, through purchase, exchange, lease, gift, or corporate distribution, any right, title, or interest in (1) any certificate of public convenience and necessity of such carrier, or (2) all or substantially all the properties of such carrier of use in its operations under any such certificate, or (3) voting stock or other voting evidences of interest in such carrier in an amount sufficient to obtain control of such carrier.

(b) Any person or corporation may apply to the commission for the approval and authorization of any such proposed consolidation, merger, or acquisition. The application shall set out the terms and conditions of the proposed consolidation, merger, or acquisition and such other information as the commission may require. If it is decided in accordance with the procedure provided in section 3, that the proposed consolidation, merger, or acquisition will be in the public interest, an order shall be issued (1) approving such consolidation, merger, or acquisition upon the terms and conditions set out in the application, or with such modification thereof and upon such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed in the public interest, and (2) granting authority to any corporation or person involved in the consolidation, merger, or acquisition necessary to carry into effect the consolidation, merger, or acquisition as approved. Any such corporation or person, and any corporation or person to whom a certificate of public convenience and necessity is issued or transferred under this act, shall be relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws, as designated in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and from all other restraints and prohibitions of Federal or State laws—in so far as may be necessary to enable such corporation or person to carry into effect the consolidation, merger, or acquisition as approved and to conduct the operations authorized by the certificate.

(c) No consolidation, merger, or acquisition of control shall be approved under this section if more than one of the corporations involved is engaged, directly or indirectly, in the transportation of persons by railroad.

SECURITY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC

SEC. 10. (a) No certificate or charter carrier permit shall be issued to a motor carrier, or remain in force, unless such carrier complies with such rules and regulations as the commission shall adopt governing the filing and approval of surety bonds, policies of insurance, or other securities or agreements, in such form and adequate amount and conditioned as the commission may require, for the payment, within limits of liability fixed by the commission, of any final judgment recovered against such motor carrier on account of death of or injury to persons, or loss of or damage to property, resulting from the operation, maintenance, or use of motor vehicles under such certificate or permit.

(b) Upon the approval of any such bond, policy, security, or agreement there shall be issued to the motor carrier a certificate of approval and such copies thereof as may be necessary; and no such carrier shall operate, maintain, or use any motor vehicle under a certificate of public convenience and necessity, or a charter carrier permit, unless there is posted in such motor vehicle, in accordance with such regulations as the commission may prescribe, a copy of such certificate of approval.

RATES, FARES, AND CHARGES

SEC. 11. (a) Tariffs of common carriers by motor vehicle covering operations under certificates of public convenience and necessity issued under this act shall be stated in money and shall be in effect only when prepared, filed, and posted in such manner as the commission shall by regulation prescribe.

(b) No such carrier shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for the transportation of persons, or for any service in connection therewith, between the points named in such tariffs, than the rates, fares, or charges specified in the tariffs in effect at the time; and no such carrier shall refund or remit in any manner or by any device any portion of the rates, fares, or charges so specified, nor extend to any person any privileges or facilities for the transportation of persons in interstate or foreign commerce, except such as are specified in such tariffs; except that any such carrier may issue or give free tickets, free passes, and free or reduced transportation to persons engaged in the service of such carrier.

(c) No change shall be made in any rate, fare, or charge specified in any tariff in effect, except after 30 days' notice of the proposed change filed and posted in like manner. Such notice shall plainly state the change proposed to be made and the time when such change will take effect. The commission may, in its discretion and for good cause shown, allow changes upon less notice than that herein specified, or modify the requirements of this section with respect to the posting and filing of tariffs, either in particular instances or by general order applicable to special or peculiar circumstances or conditions.

(d) The rates, fares, and charges of such carriers for operations under any certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under this act, shall be just and reasonable. Any person, corporation, or State

board may make complaint in writing to the commission that any such rate, fare, or charge, in effect or proposed to be put into effect, is or will be unjust or unreasonable. If, after any such complaint, it is decided, in accordance with the procedure provided in section 3, that the rate, fare, or charge complained of is or will be unjust or unreasonable, an appropriate order shall be issued in conformity with such decision. No such rate, fare, or charge shall be held to be unjust or unreasonable by the commission or by any joint board, under this act, on the ground that it is unjust to a competing carrier engaged in a different kind of transportation. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the commission to fix a rate, fare, or charge.

(e) In any proceeding to determine the justness or reasonableness of any rate, fare, or charge of any such carrier there shall not be taken into consideration or allowed as evidence or elements of value of the property of such carrier either good will, earning power, or the certificate under which such carrier is operating; and in applying for and receiving a certificate under this act any such carrier shall be deemed to have agreed to the provisions of this subsection on its own behalf and on behalf of all transferees of such certificate.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be held to extinguish any remedy or right of action under other law.

ORDERS, NOTICES, AND SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of every motor carrier to file with the board of each State in which it operates under a certificate or charter carrier permit issued under this act, and with the commission a designation in writing of the name and post-office address of a person or corporation upon whom or which service of notices or orders may be made under this act. Such designation may from time to time be changed by like writing similarly filed. Service of notices or orders in proceedings under this act may be made upon a motor carrier by personal service upon it or upon the person or corporation so designated by it, or by registered mail addressed to it or to such person or corporation at the address filed. In default of such designation, service of any notice or order may be made by posting in the office of the secretary or clerk of the board of the State wherein the motor carrier maintains headquarters and in the office of the commission. Whenever notice is given by mail as provided herein the date of mailing shall be considered as the time when notice is served.

(b) Every such motor carrier shall file with the board of each State in which it operates a designation in writing of the name and post-office address of a person or corporation in such State upon whom process issued by or under the authority of any court having jurisdiction of the subject matter may be served in any proceeding at law or equity brought against such carrier. Such designation may from time to time be changed by like writing similarly filed. In the event such carrier fails to file such designation, service may be made upon any employee of such motor carrier within such State.

UNLAWFUL OPERATION

SEC. 13. (a) Any corporation or person willfully violating any provision of this act, or any final order thereunder, or any term or condition of any certificate of public convenience and necessity or charter carrier permit, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$100 for the first offense, and not more than \$500 for any subsequent offense. Each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

(b) If any motor carrier operates in violation of any provision of this act, or of any final order thereunder, or of any term or condition of any certificate of public convenience and necessity or charter carrier permit, the commission or any party injured may apply to the district court of the United States for any district where such motor carrier operates, for the enforcement of such provision of this act or of such order, term, or condition; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by a writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such carrier, its officers, agents, employees, and representatives from further violation of such provision of this act or of such order, term, or condition, and enjoining upon it or them obedience thereto.

POWERS OF STATES

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing in this act contained shall be construed to affect the powers of taxation of the several States or to authorize a motor carrier to do an intrastate business on the highways of any State. It is not intended hereby to interfere with the exclusive exercise by each State of the power of regulation of intrastate commerce by motor carriers on the highways thereof, and notwithstanding this act, motor carriers operating in intrastate commerce on the highways of a State shall continue to be subject to the laws of the State regulating such intrastate commerce; and motor carriers operating in interstate commerce shall be subject to the proper exercise by the State of its police powers.

(b) The commission while acting under authority of this act shall not have any jurisdiction or authority over intrastate commerce by motor carriers, and the commission is expressly prohibited from interfering in any way with or attempting to regulate such intrastate commerce by motor carriers.

EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO ALTER, AMEND, OR REPEAL

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of this act is hereby expressly reserved.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 18. This act may be cited as the "Federal motor carrier act, 1930."

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUDDLESTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instruction to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause of the bill and substitute therefor the following:

"That no carrier shall operate or use a motor vehicle for the transportation of passengers as a common carrier for hire in interstate or foreign commerce within the United States unless there is in force with respect to such vehicle a surety bond conforming to the requirements of this act. The surety bond—

"(1) Shall bind the surety thereunder to compensate any person (other than such carrier or an officer or employee thereof) for personal injury, death, damage to and loss of property, and failure to perform in whole or in part any contract of carriage—if and to the extent that such carrier is liable therefor by law, and if the injury, death, damage, loss, or failure occurs in connection with or as a result of such operation or use.

"(2) Shall be in such amount and with such sureties as the Interstate Commerce Commission deems adequate for the protection of the public interest.

"(3) Shall include such terms and conditions, not in conflict with any other provision of this act, as the commission may prescribe as necessary for the protection of the public interest.

"(4) Shall not require the payment of compensation under the bond of more than \$5,000 in the case of immediate death or of more than \$7,500 in the case of injury or of death other than immediate death.

"(5) May limit the amount of compensation under the bond for damage to or loss of baggage by any one person to a value of the baggage declared in writing by the passenger or agreed upon by the carrier and passenger, if the carrier establishes and maintains differentials in its rates based upon such value and approved by the commission as just and reasonable.

"(6) Shall include a provision appointing the carrier as the attorney of the surety under such bond upon whom process may be served in any suit instituted as provided in section 3, and a provision whereby the surety consent that in any such suit service upon the carrier shall constitute service upon the surety.

"SEC. 2. No surety bond required by this act shall be held in force for the purposes of this act until approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission as being in conformity with the requirements of section 1. Upon the approval of any such bond, the commission shall issue a certificate of approval to the carrier and such copies thereof as may be necessary. No motor vehicle shall be operated or used by any carrier for the transportation of passengers for hire as a common carrier in interstate or foreign commerce within the United States unless there is posted in such vehicle, in accordance with such regulations as the commission may prescribe, a copy of the certificate of approval of the commission. If at any time the commission finds that a surety bond then in force is not in such amount or with such sureties as the commission deems adequate for the protection of the public interest, or otherwise fails to conform to the requirements of section 1, the commission shall declare that the surety bond is no longer in force for the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 3. Any person entitled to compensation under a surety bond required by this act may recover thereon in any court of competent jurisdiction in a suit against the surety in which the carrier shall be joined as a party defendant; except that no district court of the United States whose territorial jurisdiction lies within any State shall have jurisdiction of any such suit solely upon the ground that the right of recovery arises under a law of the United States or that the suit is between citizens of different States. Recovery upon any such bond shall not be held to preclude recovery against the carrier for liability in excess of the amount of the recovery upon the bond. This act shall not be held to extinguish any remedy or right of action under other law.

"SEC. 4. Any carrier operating or using a motor vehicle in violation of the provisions of this act shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$100, to be collected in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States. In the case of each motor vehicle so operated or used each day or part thereof during which such operation or use continues shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed a separate violation.

SEC. 5. As used in this act—

(a) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between any place in a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or Territory or within the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof.

(b) The term "motor vehicle" means any land vehicle propelled by an internal-combustion engine, electricity, or steam, except a vehicle propelled only upon a rail or rails, and includes any vehicle attached or propelled by any such vehicle.

(c) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, means the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, but does not include possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to execute its functions under this act.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 237, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—104

Abernethy	Crisp	Johnson, Okla.	Norton
Allgood	Davis	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connell, R. I.
Almon	Doughton	Johnson, Tex.	Oldfield
Arnold	Doxey	Jones, Tex.	Oliver, Ala.
Auf der Heide	Drane	Kading	Owen
Ayres	Eslick	Kearns	Palmisano
Bell	Evans, Mont.	Kemp	Parks
Bland	Fisher	Kerr	Patman
Box	Fulmer	Kvale	Patterson
Brand, Ga.	Gambrill	LaGuardia	Peavey
Brand, Ohio	Garner	Lambertson	Pou
Briggs	Garrett	Lampert	Ragon
Browning	Gavagan	Langley	Ramspeck
Busby	Glover	Lankford, Ga.	Rankin
Byrns	Greenwood	Larsen	Romjue
Campbell, Iowa	Gregory	Linthicum	Rutherford
Cannon	Hall, Miss.	Lozier	Sanders, Tex.
Cartwright	Halsey	Ludlow	Selvig
Christgau	Hare	McCormack, Mass.	Speaks
Clark, Md.	Hastings	McMillan	Steagall
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Ala.	McReynolds	Stevenson
Collins	Howard	McSwain	Tarver
Connery	Huddleston	Moore, Ky.	Tucker
Cooper, Tenn.	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Warren
Cox	Hull, Wis.	Morehead	Williams
Craddock	Jeffers	Nelson, Mo.	Woodrum

NAYS—237

Ackerman	Cooper, Wis.	Gifford	Kless
Adkins	Corning	Goodwin	Kincheloe
Aldrich	Crall	Grandfield	Kinzer
Allen	Cramton	Green	Kopp
Andresen	Cross	Guyer	Korell
Andrew	Crowther	Hadley	Lankford, Va.
Arentz	Culkin	Hale	Lea, Calif.
Aswell	Cullen	Hall, Ill.	Leavitt
Bacharach	Dallinger	Hall, Ind.	Leech
Bachmann	Darrow	Hall, N. Dak.	Letts
Baird	Davenport	Hancock	Lindsay
Barbour	Denison	Hardy	Luce
Beck	DeRouen	Haugen	McClintic, Okla.
Beedy	Duglas, Ariz.	Hawley	McClintock, Ohio.
Beers	Doutrich	Hess	McDuffie
Blackburn	Dowell	Hickey	McDadden
Bloom	Driver	Hill, Wash.	McKeown
Bohn	Dunbar	Hoch	McLaughlin
Bolton	Dyer	Hoffman	McLeod
Bowman	Eaton, Colo.	Hogg	Maas
Brigham	Elliott	Holaday	Magrady
Brumm	Ellis	Hoopar	Mansfield
Brunner	Englebright	Hope	Mapes
Burdick	Estep	Hopkins	Martin
Burness	Esterly	Houston, Del.	Mead
Cable	Evans, Calif.	Hudson	Menges
Campbell, Pa.	Fenn	Hull, Morton D.	Merritt
Cannfield	Finley	Hull, Wilham E.	Michener
Carter, Calif.	Fish	Irwin	Miller
Carter, Wyo.	Fitzgerald	Jenkins	Milligan
Chalmers	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Ind.	Montague
Clague	Fort	Johnson, Nebr.	Montet
Clarke, N. Y.	Foss	Johnson, Wash.	Mooney
Cochran, Pa.	Frear	Johnson, Mo.	Moore, Ohio
Cole	Free	Jonas, N. C.	Morgan
Collier	Freeman	Kahn	Mouser
Colton	French	Kelly	Murphy
Connolly	Fuller	Kendall, Ky.	Nelson, Wis.
Cooke	Garber, Va.	Kendall, Pa.	Newhall
Cooper, Ohio	Gibson	Ketcham	Niedringhaus
		Kiefner	Nolan

O'Connell, N. Y.	Rogers	Spearing
O'Connor, La.	Rowbottom	Sproul, Ill.
O'Connor, Okla.	Sanders, N. Y.	Stafford
Palmer	Sandlin	Stalker
Parker	Schafer, Wis.	Stone
Perkins	Schneider	Strong, Kans.
Pittenger	Seger	Strong, Pa.
Porter	Shaffer, Va.	Summers, Wash.
Prall	Short, Mo.	Swanson
Pratt, Harcourt J.	Shott, W. Va.	Swick
Pritchard	Simmons	Taber
Purnell	Simms	Temple
Quin	Sinclair	Thatcher
Rainey, Henry T.	Sloan	Thompson
Ramey, Frank M.	Smith, Idaho	Thurston
Ramseyer	Smith, W. Va.	Timberlake
Rayburn	Snell	Tinkham
Reece	Snow	Treadway
Robinson	Sparks	Underhill

NOT VOTING—87

Bacon	Douglass, Mass.	Lehlbach	Sullivan, Pa.
Bankhead	Doyle	McCormick, Ill.	Summers, Tex.
Black	Drewry	Manlove	Swing
Boylan	Eaton, N. J.	Michaelson	Taylor, Colo.
Britten	Edwards	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Tenn.
Browne	Garber, Okla.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Tilson
Buckbee	Gasque	Oliver, N. Y.	Turpin
Butler	Golder	Pratt, Ruth	Underwood
Carley	Goldsborough	Quayle	Vestal
Celler	Graham	Ransley	Vincent, Mich.
Chase	Griffin	Reed, N. Y.	Vinson, Ga.
Chindblom	Hammer	Reid, Ill.	Walker
Christopherson	Hartley	Sabath	White
Clancy	Hudspeth	Sears	Whitehead
Clark, N. C.	Igoe	Seiberling	Wolfenden
Coyle	James	Shreve	Wood
Curry	Johnson, Ill.	Sirovich	Wright
Dempsey	Knutson	Somers, N. Y.	Wurzbach
De Priest	Kunz	Sproul, Kans.	Wyant
Dickinson	Kurtz	Stedman	Yates
Dickstein	Lanham	Stobbs	Zihlman
Dominick	Lee, Tex.	Sullivan, N. Y.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Gasque (for) with Mr. Shreeve (against).
 Mr. Wright (for) with Mr. Swing (against).
 Mr. Whitehead (for) with Mr. Bacon (against).
 Mr. Edwards (for) with Mrs. Ruth Pratt (against).
 Mr. Bankhead (for) with Mr. Wood (against).
 Mr. Dominick (for) with Mr. Vestal (against).
 Mr. Hammer (for) with Mr. Chindblom (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Tilson with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Graham with Mr. Lanham.
 Mr. Buckbee with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Clark of North Carolina.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. Boylan.
 Mr. Clancy with Mr. Steadman.
 Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Black.
 Mr. Golder with Mr. Somers of New York.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Igoe.
 Mr. Stobbs with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Turpin with Mr. Carley.
 Mr. White with Mr. Vinson of Georgia.
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Coyle with Mr. Lee of Texas.
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
 Mr. Knutson with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Sears with Mr. Oliver of New York.
 Mr. Browne with Mr. Summers of Texas.
 Mr. Chase with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Vincent of Michigan with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Nelson of Maine with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mrs. McCormick of Illinois with Mr. Hudspeth.
 Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. De Priest with Mr. Hartley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 115, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—221

Ackerman	Brumm	Cooke	Dunbar
Adkins	Brunner	Cooper, Ohio	Dyer
Aldrich	Buchanan	Cooper, Wis.	Eaton, Colo.
Allen	Burdick	Corning	Eaton, N. J.
Andresen	Burness	Cox	Elliott
Arentz	Cable	Crall	Ellis
Aswell	Campbell, Pa.	Cross	Englebright
Bacharach	Cannfield	Crosser	Estep
Baird	Carter, Calif.	Crowther	Esterly
Barbour	Carter, Wyo.	Cullen	Evans, Calif.
Beedy	Chalmers	Dallinger	Fenn
Beers	Clague	Darrow	Finley
Blackburn	Clarke, N. Y.	Davenport	Fitzgerald
Bloom	Cochran, Pa.	Denison	Fitzpatrick
Bohn	Cole	DeRouen	Fort
Bolton	Collier	Douglas, Ariz.	Foss
Bowman	Connery	Doutrich	Frear
Brigham	Connolly	Dowell	Free

Freeman	Kendall, Pa.	Mouser	Snell
Garber, Va.	Kiefner	Murphy	Snow
Gibson	Kiess	Newhall	Spearling
Gifford	Kincheloe	Niedringhaus	Sprout, Ill.
Goodwin	Kinzer	Nolan	Stafford
Granfield	Kopp	O'Connell, N. Y.	Stalker
Green	Korell	O'Connell, R. I.	Stone
Guyer	LaGuardia	O'Connor, La.	Strong, Kans.
Hadley	Lampert	O'Connor, Okla.	Strong, Pa.
Hale	Lankford, Va.	Palmer	Summers, Wash.
Hall, Ill.	Lea, Calif.	Parker	Swanson
Hall, Ind.	Leavitt	Peavey	Swick
Hall, N. Dak.	Leech	Perkins	Taber
Hancock	Leibach	Pittenger	Temple
Hardy	Lindsay	Prall	Thatcher
Haugen	Linthicum	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Thompson
Hawley	Luce	Pritchard	Thurston
Hess	McClintock, Ohio	Purnell	Timberlake
Hickey	McCormack, Mass.	Quin	Tinkham
Hill, Wash.	McDuffie	Ragon	Treadway
Hoch	McFadden	Ramey, Frank M.	Underhill
Hoffman	McKeown	Ramseyer	Wason
Hogg	McLaughlin	Rayburn	Watres
Holaday	McLeod	Reece	Watson
Hooper	Maas	Robinson	Welch, Calif.
Hope	Magrady	Rogers	Welsh, Pa.
Hopkins	Mapes	Rowbottom	Whitley
Hudson	Martin	Sanders, N. Y.	Whittington
Hull, Morton D.	Mead	Sandlin	Wigglesworth
Hull, William E.	Menges	Schafer, Wis.	Wilson
Jenkins	Merritt	Schneider	Wolverton, N. J.
Johnson, Ind.	Michener	Seger	Wolverton, W. Va.
Johnson, Wash.	Miller	Shaffer, Va.	Wood
Johnston, Mo.	Milligan	Short, Mo.	Woodruff
Jones, N. C.	Monte	Simmons	Yon
Kading	Mooney	Simms	
Kahn	Moore, Ohio	Sinclair	
Kelly	Morgan	Sloan	

NAYS—115

Abernethy	Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver, Ala.
Allgood	Doxey	Johnson, Tex.	Owen
Almon	Drane	Jones, Tex.	Palmisano
Arnold	Driver	Kearns	Parks
Auf der Heide	Eslick	Kemp	Patman
Ayres	Evans, Mont.	Kendall, Ky.	Patterson
Bachmann	Fisher	Kerr	Pou
Bell	French	Ketcham	Rainey, Henry T.
Bland	Fuller	Kvale	Ramspeck
Box	Fulmer	Lambertson	Rankin
Brand, Ga.	Gambrill	Langley	Romjue
Brand, Ohio	Garrett	Lankford, Ga.	Rutherford
Briggs	Gavagan	Larsen	Sanders, Tex.
Browning	Glover	Letts	Selvig
Busby	Greenwood	Lozier	Shott, W. Va.
Byrns	Gregory	Ludlow	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Iowa	Hall, Miss.	McClintock, Okla.	Smith, W. Va.
Cannon	Halsey	McMillan	Sparks
Cartwright	Hare	McReynolds	Speaks
Christgau	Hastings	McSwain	Steagall
Christopherson	Hill, Ala.	Montague	Stevenson
Clark, Md.	Howard	Moore, Ky.	Tarver
Cochran, Mo.	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Collins	Hull, Tenn.	Morehead	Warren
Colton	Hull, Wis.	Nelson, Mo.	Williams, Tex.
Cooper, Tenn.	Irwin	Nelson, Wis.	Williamson
Craddock	Jeffers	Norton	Wingo
Crisp	Johnson, Nebr.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Woodrum
Davis	Johnson, Okla.	Oldfield	

NOT VOTING—92

Andrew	Dickstein	Kurtz	Stobbs
Bacon	Dominick	Lanham	Sullivan, N. Y.
Bankhead	Dougllass, Mass.	Lee, Tex.	Sullivan, Pa.
Beck	Doyle	McCormick, Ill.	Summers, Tex.
Black	Drewry	Manlove	Swing
Boylan	Edwards	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Britten	Fish	Michaelson	Tilson
Browne	Garber, Okla.	Nelson, Me.	Tucker
Buckbee	Garner	Oliver, N. Y.	Turpin
Butler	Gasque	Porter	Underwood
Carley	Golder	Pratt, Ruth	Vestal
Celler	Goldsborough	Quayle	Vincent, Mich.
Chase	Graham	Ransley	Vinson, Ga.
Chindblom	Griffin	Reed, N. Y.	Wainwright
Clancy	Hammer	Reid, Ill.	Walker
Clark, N. C.	Hartley	Sabath	White
Coyle	Houston, Del.	Sears	Whitehead
Cramton	Hudspeth	Seiberling	Wolfenden
Culkin	Igoe	Shreve	Wright
Curry	James	Sirovich	Wurzbach
Dempsey	Johnson, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.	Wyant
De Priest	Knutson	Sprout, Kans.	Yates
Dickinson	Kunz	Stedman	Zihlman

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. Gasque (against).
 Mr. Swing (for) with Mr. Wright (against).
 Mr. Bacon (for) with Mr. Whitehead (against).
 Mrs. Ruth Pratt (for) with Mr. Edwards (against).
 Mr. Vestal (for) with Mr. Dominick (against).
 Mr. Chindblom (for) with Mr. Hammer (against).
 Mr. Buckbee (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
 Mr. Nelson of Maine (for) with Mr. Tucker (against).
 Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cramton with Mr. Garner.
 Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. James with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Vincent of Michigan with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Manlove with Mr. Clark of North Carolina.

Mr. BECK. I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. BECK. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I was not present, but I would have voted "aye" if I had been here.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. PARKER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE OF LAWSON AGAINST OWEN

Mr. BEEDY, chairman of Committee on Elections No. 1, by direction of that committee, presented a report on the contested-election case of William C. Lawson against Ruth Bryan Owen, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

AMENDING SECTION 88 OF THE JUDICIAL CODE, AS AMENDED

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3371) to amend section 88 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that this is an emergency measure.

Mr. MICHENER. It is.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 3371

An act to amend section 88 of the Judicial Code, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 88 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act of July 9, 1912, chapter 222 (sec. 168, title 28, U. S. C.), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The State of Michigan is divided into two judicial districts to be known as the eastern and western district of Michigan. The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Alcona, Alpena, Arenac, Bay, Cheboygan, Clare, Crawford, Genesee, Gladwin, Gratiot, Huron, Iosco, Isabella, Midland, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, Saginaw, Shiawassee, and Tuscola, which shall constitute the northern division; also the territory embraced on the date last mentioned in the counties of Branch, Calhoun, Clinton, Hillsdale, Ingham, Jackson, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Sanilac, Washtenaw, and Wayne, which shall constitute the southern division of said district. Terms of the district court for the southern division shall be held at Detroit on the first Tuesdays in March, June, and November; for the northern division, at Bay City, on the first Tuesdays in May and October, and at Port Huron, in the discretion of the judge of said court and at such times as he shall appoint therefor. There shall also be held a special or adjourned term of the district court at Bay City for the hearing of admiralty causes, beginning in the month of February in each year. The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Alger, Baraga, Chippewa, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Luce, Mackinac, Marquette, Menominee, Ontonagon, and Schoolcraft, which shall constitute the northern division; also the territory embraced on the said date last mentioned in the counties of Allegan, Antrim, Barry, Benzie, Berrien, Cass, Charlevoix, Eaton, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Ionia, Kalamazoo, Kalkaska, Kent, Lake, Leelanau, Manistee, Mason, Mecosta, Missaukee, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa, St. Joseph, Van Buren, and Wexford, which shall constitute the southern division of said district. Terms of the district court for the southern division shall be held at Grand Rapids on the first Tuesdays in March, May, September, and November; and for the northern division, at Marquette on the first Tuesdays in April and October and at Sault Ste. Marie on the first Tuesdays in January and June. All issues of fact shall be tried at the terms held in the division where such suit shall be commenced. Actions in rem and admiralty may be brought in whichever division of the eastern district service can be had upon the res. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the district court of the western division from regulating by general rule the venue of transitory actions either at law or in equity or from changing the same for cause. The clerk of the court for the western district shall reside and keep his office at Grand Rapids, and shall also appoint a deputy clerk for said court held at Marquette, who shall reside and keep his office at that place. The marshal for said western district shall keep an office and a deputy marshal at Marquette. The clerk of the court for the eastern district shall keep his office at the city of Detroit, and shall appoint a deputy for the court held at Bay City, who shall reside and keep his office at that place. The marshal for said district shall keep an office and a deputy marshal at Bay City, and mileage on service of process in said northern division shall be computed from Bay City."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider by Mr. MICHENER was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. WELCH

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10865) to authorize Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, to accept the awards of the French Legion of Honor.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman assure the Chair that this is an emergency case?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, be authorized to accept the awards of the Legion of Honor heretofore tendered to them by the French Government in acknowledgment of their participation in the ceremonies of 1923 in connection with the centenary of the birth of Pasteur, and in further recognition of the services of Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, in connection with his participation in the ceremonies of the Laennec Bicentenary of 1926, wherefore he was promoted in 1927 to commander in the Legion of Honor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, as I gather the purport of the bill it is to authorize an American citizen to receive some recognition by a foreign Government. Now, I remember that for 25 years or more it has been the custom of Congress to decline to permit American citizens to receive gifts or decorations from foreign governments. I happened to be a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee when this matter was threshed out, and it was the unanimous opinion that it was not in keeping with a democratic form of government to have our citizens decorated by foreign governments and accepting gifts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this is not a case in line with what the gentleman from Texas is talking about. At the last Congress we passed an omnibus bill carrying decorations to a large number of people. Furthermore, the Foreign Affairs Committee is now preparing a bill which will carry further decorations.

But let me get back to the point I want to make here. On the 8th day of April Dr. William H. Welch, one of the organizers of Johns Hopkins Hospital, and professor of history, will attain his eightieth birthday. On that day there is to be a great meeting at Constitution Hall, at which President Hoover will speak and broadcast, and at which there will be a large audience. At the same time, on the same day there will be meetings held in Leipzig, London, Paris, Tokyo, Pieping, Cincinnati, New Haven, New York, and other American and foreign cities, in honor of Doctor Welch and of his accomplishments.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. He is a private citizen?

Mr. LINTHICUM. He is a private citizen now. He is in the Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, but this is not for any service in the Army, although he did serve in the Army. It is for lectures that he delivered in France at the centenary of Pasteur. I am very anxious that on that eightieth birthday when it is being celebrated throughout the world, he shall have the right, if he chooses, to wear this Legion of Honor decoration.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. This is the Legion of Honor?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. And it was given for scholastic ability?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely; for his lectures in commemoration of Pasteur, delivered in France.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, if this decoration were not from a republic, and if it were not for such services, I would object. I am going to object hereafter to all requests to permit decorations which come from empires, monarchies, or dictators, and I serve that notice now.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas object?

Mr. GARNER. I do not object to the present consideration of the bill, but I do not believe in permitting American citizens to accept decorations from foreign governments. I have said that on the floor of this House a number of times. I feel that I ought not to object at this time because it is the policy of Congress and of the committee at this time to report similar bills, and on account of this particular situation I shall not object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, M. D., Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, M. D., Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, are members of the faculty of the Johns Hopkins Medical School and of the staff of the Johns Hopkins Hospital. Both are known

internationally throughout the civilized world among men of their profession.

Doctor Welch is one of the two surviving physicians who founded the school and the Johns Hopkins Hospital. Dr. Howard A. Kelly is the only other survivor. The other founders were the late Sir William Osler, the late Dr. W. S. Halstead, and the late Dr. Henry Hurd.

Both Doctor Thayer and Doctor Welch served with distinction in the World War, but these decorations are not the result of their military service. In the spring of 1923, the French Government held a ceremonial in honor of the centenary of the birth of Pasteur. Both Brigadier General Thayer and Brigadier General Welch were invited to make addresses in the Sorbonne on the day given the American committee for the special American celebration, Brigadier General Welch being also an official delegate from the United States to the official French celebration which followed.

At the request of the Pasteur Institute, the French Government, by decree of August 7, 1923, awarded these gentlemen the French Legion of Honor, of which my bill, H. R. 10865, speaks. These decorations await them, and will be accepted when congressional sanction is procured.

In 1926 Brigadier General Thayer, an American delegate to the Laennec Bicentenary Celebration—Laennec was the inventor of the stethoscope, and one of the greatest figures in the history of medicine—made the speech of response on behalf of the foreign delegates at the opening session at Sorbonne, and also a subsequent speech on behalf of our country.

In appreciation of his services and speeches on these occasions, he was promoted in November, 1927, to the grade of commander in the French Legion of Honor. I am particularly anxious to have the bill passed in time for the celebration in reference to Brigadier General Welch, otherwise I should not take the time of the House just now to pass the bill, but would allow it to remain and take its turn on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE TARIFF

The SPEAKER. Under order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] for one hour.

THE POLITICS OF TARIFF MAKING

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I asked for this time on Thursday last after there had been two political addresses delivered on the floor of this House on the subject of the tariff. The first was delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], during which time something was brought up in regard to the procedure on the 1913 tariff bill as compared with the procedure on the 1922 tariff bill. That provoked considerable ha-ha-ing and te-heeing on both sides of the aisle. I don't propose to discuss that matter further except to say that I have looked into the procedures of both, and it is my deliberate conclusion that neither procedure has anything on the other. One is just as indefensible as the other, and one is no more entitled to commendation than the other.

The other speech was delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]. It was a brilliant and timely address upon the subject of pseudo Republicanism. It was brilliant because it was delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] and timely because the tariff bill is about to come over here from the Senate, and everyone knows that when the bill left the House here it carried some provisions that were objectionable to the Corn and Wheat Belt regions. The gentlemen representing those regions are likely to demand that the House be given an opportunity to express itself by voting on some of those provisions. The address evidently was intended to intimidate and terrorize the gentlemen from those regions by letting them know that if they say anything or try to bring about the results they desire they will be classed as pseudo Republicans.

Some of the rates in controversy at that time were on cement, on shingles, on other building material, on hides and shoes, and several others. The hide and shoe amendment was sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], and I at that time undertook to demonstrate to the Members of this House that under that amendment, the hide and shoe amendment, the farmers of the country were being skinned to the tune of at least 455 per cent.

We all know that there have been two coalitions over in the Senate. The backbone of one of the coalitions was the Republi-

can Senators from the Northwest; and I am here to tell you, familiar as I think I am with the sentiment and feeling of those States, that those Senators represented the sentiment of the people of the Northwest on tariff rates. [Applause.] The backbone of the other coalition was composed of all the Republican Senators from the States of New York and Pennsylvania who are now in this country, and I leave it to gentlemen from those regions to state whether or not the latter coalition represented the honest views of the eastern and northeastern portions of the country. I wish to assure you that you can get up here and express your honest convictions on any phase of the tariff bill without fear that I or anyone else from the Northwest will indulge in calling you derogatory names. [Applause.] When this Northwest coalition—both coalitions had Democrats in them, and neither could have accomplished anything without the aid of the Democrats—was going strong, we heard applied to that coalition from the East such terms as "pseudo-Republicans" and "sons of the wild jackass."

Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who evidently is not an expert on zoology, simply referred to them as "those animals." According to some of these easterners when the first coalition was going strong its members were anathema, but when some of these same members switched and joined the second coalition the members so switching at once became blessed.

I want to tell you if we are to make progress in getting together on the tariff bill we must act the part of gentlemen and meet each other on honest and fair terms and in the open where our acts can be judged by all men. [Applause.] We should not try to gain advantage by hurling names or laughing one another out of court. You know every age has had some fellow going around with a beam in his eye attempting to pick the mote out of the other fellow's eye. Such men existed in the days of the Master. I wish to quote, not with reference to anything that has gone by, because that may have taken place thoughtlessly, but hereafter when anyone is tempted to use those terms or indulge in that kind of argument I want him to know that the Master once upon a time said:

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eyes and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

When I asked for time last Thursday I had no intention of discussing the question of the procedure when the tariff bill comes over here. I have here a prepared address which was in its present form, except for the last page, before the present session of Congress convened, and it was the substance of that address on the Politics of Tariff Making that I wanted to get before you and the country for which I sought the time. But since that time I decided that when I get through with my prepared address, which will probably take 30 minutes of my time, I will make some observations as to the procedure when the tariff bill comes here.

Now, my object in preparing this address was to present a frank discussion of some of the shortcomings of both parties on tariff making. Let us be honest with ourselves and see each other as we actually are. I crave, especially, the attention of the younger Members of this body, because my conclusion will probably not make a deep impression on those who have served in this body a long time and whose political wagons are in ruts up to the hubs.

To-day I shall discuss some phases and practices of tariff making which, I think, should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress and the American people. The matters to which I shall refer should have been considered months ago, or, better still, years ago. My address has two purposes: First, to bring to the light of day the practices that have retarded rational and scientific tariff making during the past 55 years; and, second, to bring about reforms in tariff making for the future.

On a number of occasions during the discussion of the present tariff bill I have insisted that the tariff is an economic problem and that it should not be made the football of partisan politics. Other Republicans of this House have expressed similar views. My position for a tariff commission composed of the ablest talent of the country and with ample powers has been prompted by my determination to do all in my power to hasten the day when the tariff will be transferred from the sphere of politics to the sphere of economics where it belongs. I delivered an address on the flexible tariff on the 11th day of December last. However, I think the most valuable contribution on the Tariff Commission and the flexible tariff was made in an address on the 4th of February by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT]. If any of you did not hear or read that speech, I hope you will take the time to read it soon. It will be worth your while.

Part of my discussion will revolve around the practice of excluding minority members of the Ways and Means Committee from participation in framing tariff bills and the sham that has characterized that practice by both political parties for the last half century.

During the last 50 years six tariff bills have been enacted into law. A few other tariff bills were considered during this period but failed to receive the approval of Congress. Since the convening of the special session on April 15, 1929, a tariff bill has been pending before Congress.

Hearings on the proposal to revise the present tariff law were held before the Ways and Means Committee, consisting of 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats, from January 7, 1929, to March 1, 1929. In all over 1,100 witnesses were heard. When the hearings were concluded the work of drafting the tariff bill began. The minority members of the Ways and Means Committee did not participate in the writing of the new tariff bill.

Since the World War there have been considered and enacted into law four revenue bills—the bill of 1921, the bill of 1924, the bill of 1926, and the bill of 1928. These bills dealt with taxes other than duties on imports. In the writing of the revenue bill of 1921 the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee were excluded. However, in the writing of the other three revenue bills, the Democratic members sat in with the Republican members.

I was in Congress when the tariff bill of 1922 was under consideration and enacted into law. During the writing of that bill the minority members were excluded. Somehow I got the impression then that the practice of excluding minority members when a tariff bill was being written was of ancient and honorable origin, and that the author of that practice was either a good Republican or one of the wise fathers of the Republic. I searched history to confirm my impression. I have here volume 2 of American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century, by Edward Stanwood. On page 197 I read:

Mr. Fernando Wood, of New York, was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives during the Forty-fifth Congress. He introduced the practice, which has since been usually followed, and even extended, of leaving the preparation of a tariff bill, as a party measure, to a subcommittee consisting of the members belonging to the dominant party.

The Forty-fifth Congress had its existence from 1877 to 1879. Looking up the biography of Mr. Fernando Wood, I find in the Biographical Directory of the American Congress that Mr. Wood was a Tammany Democrat.

During the six years, 1875 to 1881, the White House was occupied by Republican Presidents, and during the same period the House of Representatives was Democratic. The Senate also was Democratic during the last two years. Speaking of this period, I read in this same volume, on page 195:

In such circumstances it was possible for politicians to declare loudly and with emphasis what they would do if they had the power, secure against a demand that they make good their promises. It is therefore not surprising to find that for six years, beginning with 1875, both parties were maneuvering for position, and—as is usually the case when the choice of political principles is a matter of strategy and tactics rather than of conviction—becoming more insincere with every skirmish.

Note especially the insincerity that characterized this period. I am wondering whether a charge like that is applicable to the present situation.

During the Fiftieth Congress—1887–1889—Mr. Roger Q. Mills, a Texas Democrat, was chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means. A tariff bill was considered but was not enacted into law. The Republicans objected to the manner in which that tariff bill was being framed. Commenting on this situation I read from Stanwood, on pages 231 and 232, as follows:

It was not a new practice to exclude the minority members of the committee from the counsels of the majority until the bill was ready to be reported. But in this case there were dark hints that the measure was concocted in a subterranean room in the Capitol; that the committee entrusted the preparation of its machinations against the manufacturers to certain professional pamphleteers of the free-trade school, and that clerks in the Treasury Department were detailed to assist in making the bill as harmful as possible to the protected industries. All this was merely the partisan way of exciting early opposition to the bill, which was not yet made public. The refusal of the committee to give hearings to those whose interests were, from the protectionist point of view, at stake was quite justified, if the principle of the Democratic leaders be accepted. They maintained that the withdrawal of protection would be of general advantage and that ultimately it would benefit manufacturers. Why, then, should they listen to men who came to protest against a reduction of the tariff? As for the machinery by which the bill was prepared, they adopted the method most convenient to them—

selves. They did not expect their work to commend itself to the Republican members of the committee. Consequently a discussion of details with men whose purposes were fundamentally different from their own would be fruitless and a waste of time.

The last three sentences in the foregoing quotation undoubtedly give in a nutshell the reasons why the Democrats originated and continued the practice of excluding the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee from the executive sessions where the tariff bills were written. In other words, the Democrats in originating and continuing this practice proceeded on the theory that the views of the two parties on the tariff were so far apart that it would be impossible to reconcile their differences. That is the most charitable way in which I can formulate an excuse for this Democratic practice.

I have been unable to find what practice the majority followed in writing the tariff bill of 1883. The conference report on this bill was adopted March 3, 1883, and approved by the President but a moment before Congress reached the constitutional limit of its term. At that time there was a Republican President and both branches of Congress were Republican. One fact is disclosed by the historian in regard to the passage of this law, and that is that both parties had irregulars, and one of the Republicans who refused to maintain his party regularity and voted against the conference report on the tariff bill was Mr. William McKinley, jr., of Ohio. On page 218 of this volume appears this interesting revelation:

Nineteen Democrats, of whom 6 were from Pennsylvania, supported the bill; 12 Republicans, of whom 5 were from Ohio and 4 from Pennsylvania, voted against the conference report. The Democrats who broke away from their party acted avowedly as protectionists; the Republicans who acted independently did so because they regarded the bill as not sufficiently protective. The actual strength of the system of protection is, therefore, greater than the vote indicates. The most distinguished Members who would not vote with the majority of their respective parties were William McKinley, jr., of Ohio, and Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania.

Now I am going to give you a sidelight on the tariff act of 1909. I quote from Taussig's *The Tariff History of the United States*, on page 376:

So the bill went to a conference committee, and there, as usual, its details were finally settled. The conference committee consisted of eight Members from each House, five Republicans and three Democrats. The Democrats were put on the committee only pro forma. The 10 Republicans from the two Houses got together by themselves and came to an agreement against which the six Democrats simply registered the stock partisan protest. Such has been the procedure with all the tariff legislation of the last generation. What passed in the conference committee can only be guessed, but guessed with some certainty; weary sessions, hurried procedure, give and take, insistence by this or that Member among the 10 on some duty in which he is particularly interested. Irresponsibility in legislation reaches its acme.

These historical references establish: First, that the practice of excluding minority members of the Ways and Means Committee from executive sessions in which tariff bills are framed did not originate with a Republican or with any of the fathers of the Republic; second, the Democrats are entitled to all the glory of originating this practice; and third, that the Republicans in following this practice are merely aping the Democrats of the seventies and eighties.

For 50 years every time a tariff bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee the minority, with two exceptions—the bill of 1883 and the bill of 1890, both Republican bills—set up a protest against the practice of the majority in excluding the minority from participation in the writing of the tariff bill. I shall now proceed to examine the minority reports on the subject under discussion. When the Mills bill of 1888 was reported, Mr. McKinley presented the views of the minority, as follows:

The extraordinary manner in which this bill came to the committee and the total lack of consideration given to so grave a measure by those charged with its investigation demand notice and comment. It was fashioned outside of the committee, and reached it not by the reference of the House, which is the usual channel through which committees obtain jurisdiction of a subject. It was presented ready-made by the chairman of the committee, was framed, completed, and printed without the knowledge of the minority and without consideration or discussion in the full committee.

If any consultations were held, the minority were excluded. Thus originating after three months of the session had gone, it was submitted to the committee. Since there has been no consideration of it. Every effort upon the part of the minority to obtain from the majority the facts and information upon which they constructed the bill proved unavailing; a resolution to refer the bill to the Secretary of the Treasury for a statement of its probable effects upon the revenue, together with a

statistical abstract, which would facilitate its consideration by the committee and the House, was voted down by a strict party vote. (50th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Rept. No. 1496, p. 17, ser. 2602.)

On the McKinley bill of 1890 the minority report discloses no criticism of the methods and procedure of the majority in writing and reporting that bill.

The interesting facts thus far developed in regard to William McKinley by my research are:

First. He protested vigorously against the practice initiated by Fernando Wood, a Tammany Democrat, of excluding the minority from participation in the framing of tariff bills.

Second. He voted against his party on the tariff bill of 1883, choosing rather to be right according to his lights than to be regular.

Third. He reported the tariff bill of 1890, against which the minority in their report registered no word of protest on the method and procedure of framing that bill.

When the Wilson bill of 1894 was reported, the Republicans intervened their protest on the method of framing that bill, as follows:

It would of course be utterly impossible to follow into details the reasons which have induced the changes made by the bill. They seem to be the result of information obtained in secret, and in no wise communicated to the Republicans on the committee. All the public hearings and public testimony have been set aside and the bill has been framed on information of witnesses who have not been cross-examined, and whose testimony has not visited the light of day. (53d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 234, p. 20.)

When the Dingley bill of 1897 was reported the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee expressed themselves, as follows:

We are unable to offer a substitute for the pending bill because we have not been allowed a reasonable time to prepare one. Congress convened in extraordinary session on Monday, the 15th day of March, and this bill was introduced the same day and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, which met the next morning; and on Thursday it was ordered to be reported to the House. The majority of the committee had spent the three months of the last session of the last Congress in the preparation of their bill, and yet they refused to allow the minority three weeks in which to prepare a substitute. (55th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 1, pt. 2; views of the minority, p. 4, serial 3588.)

When the Payne tariff bill of 1909 was reported the Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee expressed themselves in the following language:

When the long and laborious "hearings" closed the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means segregated themselves from the Democratic members and spent almost three months in incubating the Payne tariff bill. * * *

Having spent nearly three months in framing their bill, they (the Republican members) called in the Democratic members, and in precisely 12 minutes reported it back to the House without one moment's discussion, without changing a word, without even reading the title. * * *

This happened on March 18, and no member of the minority had ever seen the bill or any paragraph thereof till noon on Wednesday, the 17th of March, and had not the remotest idea of its provisions except by the merest guesswork. (61st Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 1, pt. 2; minority views, p. 2, serial 5591.)

When the Underwood tariff bill of 1913 was presented to the House of Representatives the Republican minority expressed their contempt for the action of the Democrats in excluding them from any part in writing the bill in these sentences:

In this statement we shall not attempt to analyze this bill or to criticize it in detail. Our acquaintance with it is too brief to permit this. * * *

In the brief time that this bill has been permitted to see the light of day there has been little opportunity for the minority of the committee, who saw it first when it was introduced in the House, to study its provisions. (63d Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 5; views of the minority, pp. 55 and 57, serial 6514.)

From the minority report which accompanied the Fordney tariff bill of 1922 I quote a few sentences at random to show what the Democrats thought of the practice that they themselves had originated and continued every time they, as a majority, reported a tariff bill:

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee are still in the antediluvian period when it comes to writing a tariff bill. They still believe in and follow the "star chamber" methods of the last century.

When it comes to using big words you can not beat the Democrats. I did not know before they had tariff bills in the time before Noah. [Laughter.]

Then follows the passage I read to you a few minutes ago from the McKinley minority report on the Mills bill of 1888, which was quoted approvingly. The report continues:

We had hoped that such methods were gone forever.

Further on in this report I read:

The manner of making up this bill can not be defended. The bill was prepared outside of the committee.

Another sentence:

In other words, the minority knew absolutely nothing as to the contents of this bill until it was introduced Thursday, June 30, although, as has been stated, the hearings closed on February 26, 1921, and the majority have been preparing the bill since that date.

By reference to the minority reports accompanying tariff bills for the last 50 years I have shown you that the performances and wails of the minority are about the same whether made by Republicans or Democrats. I shall now call attention to the performance and attitude of the minority on the pending tariff bill, or probably it would be more accurate for me to say the lack of performance and the lack of attitude of the minority party toward the pending tariff bill.

During the hearings, which continued over a period of two months, the 10 Democratic members sat with the 15 Republican members in a committee room that has accommodations for only 19 members. The Democratic members occupied the best seats on the committee stage and consumed probably two-thirds of the time allotted to cross-examination of witnesses. Six of the Republican members occupied seats among the clerks and witnesses, or had to stand up. After the hearings were completed the Republican members worked day and night in framing the bill until it was reported out on the 7th day of May.

From the 1st of March to May 7 the Democratic members were assigned no duties and they assumed none on their own initiative. They heard and read the same evidence that the Republican members did, and at their service were also all the experts of the Tariff Commission. During all that time, so far as my information goes, the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, as a group or in special committees, had no meetings to write a tariff bill such as they could support and recommend to the country. They seemed to content themselves with letting the Republican members assume all the responsibility. The result was that when the tariff bill was considered on the floor of the House the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had absolutely no program of their own and offered no amendment or amendments either to help the farmers with the commodities produced by them or to lessen the burdens of the farmers on the commodities consumed by them.

Permit me to interpose here, parenthetically, that if the practice of excluding minority Members in writing tariff bills is to be continued, it should be extended to exclude minority Members from participation in the hearings, where they occupy space, consume valuable time, flatter all the witnesses, play to the galleries, and afterwards apply the information and knowledge they acquired in the hearings to no useful purpose.

It is customary, where there is a sharp party difference on a bill pending before the House, that the minority in their motion to recommit unite on a legislative proposal to show the country what they would have done if they had been in the majority. The motion to recommit offered by the minority on this tariff bill was perfectly innocuous in so far as the interests of the farmers were concerned. The two proposals in their motion to recommit, if adopted, would not in the slightest degree have affected the welfare and prosperity of the farmers.

The time was when one could not discuss the tariff without arousing considerable partisan feeling. I believe that time is past. The tariff problem is economic and not political. We should approach the consideration of the tariff with the same coolness of judgment and common sense as we do any other important public question.

Protection to American agriculture, industry, and labor has become a fixed national policy. There are not many free traders left in this country, and there are but few Democrats in Congress who still advocate the policy of a tariff for revenue only. Four or five decades ago the two political parties were far apart in their views on the tariff question. It must be conceded that those differences are not as pronounced now as formerly.

According to some high authorities in both political parties the line of demarcation separating the two great political parties on the tariff seems to have almost vanished. During the last campaign the Republican chairman of the national Democratic committee devoted a good part of his time and energy in an attempt to convince the country that the Democrats had become as good protectionists as the Republicans ever dared to be. [Applause.]

During the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means numerous Democrats in and out of Congress appeared urging increased duties on the products of the farms, the factories, and the mines in their States. In fact, the most urgent demands for higher duties came from witnesses from the South, which for generations prior to the last election had been consistently and solidly Democratic. Twenty Democrats in all voted for the House tariff bill, which included all the Democratic Representatives from Florida, all the Democratic Representatives from Louisiana but one, and one or more Democrats from each of the States of Massachusetts, New York, Indiana, Texas, Rhode Island, Colorado, Ohio, California, and Washington.

The tariff is a great economic problem. It should be considered from a nonpolitical standpoint. The tariff affects the weal and woe of the great masses of the people. The practice of political parties to take this attitude or that attitude on so vital a problem as a matter of strategy and tactics rather than of conviction should be condemned by every well-wisher of the Republic.

In studying the history of tariff legislation I am inclined to doubt that the different tariff laws have had as much to do with the success and defeat of political parties in this country as many seem to think. The tariff law of 1890 was followed by the defeat of the party and the author of the law. The tariff law of 1894 was followed by the defeat of the party that was in power when the law was written, but the paramount issue in the campaign of 1896 was the money question and not the tariff question. The Republicans wrote the tariff law of 1897 and remained in power until 1913. The tariff question was not the main issue in 1900 nor in 1904. The tariff law of 1909 was followed by Democratic success. There were numerous issues and complications in the campaign of 1912, but it was the split in the Republican Party that gave the Democrats the election with a minority of the popular vote. The causes that swung the country back to the Republican Party in 1920 were legion, and that party enacted the tariff law of 1922 and has continued in power to this day.

The outstanding issue in the last campaign was agriculture. There was no assault by either party on the protective-tariff principle. The farmers want the protective tariff applied to them with the same effect as it is applied to the industries. The farmers made no assault on the principle of the protective tariff. The farmers of the country and the people generally thought the Republican standard bearer was better qualified and that the Republican organization was better equipped to bring about a condition highly desired by both the farmers and the people generally.

Even though the practice of excluding the minority from participation in writing tariff bills has prevailed for a half century, and still prevails, I have no sympathy with the attitude of the minority either on the pending tariff bill or on any tariff bill that has been reported under this practice in absolving themselves from all feeling of duty and responsibility to present their views in a concrete form and to do all in their power to get their views before the country and enacted into law. The party in the minority should seek to help and to serve and to promote the public interest. A party deserves to win only on its record of service and on the attitude with which it faces the problems of the future. A party that depends on the mistakes of the opposition and maneuvers for position by advocating now this thing and then that thing may get into power, but a victory so won is sure to be short lived and unfruitful. To both Republicans and Democrats I commend this saying of Confucius:

It concerneth me not that I hold not office; what concerneth me is to make myself worthy of office.

[Applause.]

I have in my possession the platform declarations of the major political parties of the last half century. I have them on the tariff question, on the cost-of-production issue, and on the Tariff Commission or Tariff Board controversy. I had intended to present them for the Record. Both of the parties have done considerable wabbling on these issues.

Instead of burdening the Record with these various party platform declarations, I shall quote brief passages, which apply forcibly to the subject under discussion, from the two men who hold the chief places of power in this country—President Hoover and Speaker LONGWORTH. I shall first quote from the Speaker, who occupies the second place of power. In his inaugural address of April 15 last, in discussing the objects for which the Congress was called into extra session, and speaking against a general revision of the tariff, he said:

Why, then, should we go further than to remedy cases of glaring inconsistency? Our general protective policy remains the same. The

line of cleavage between the two great political parties would seem to have crumbled in the past few years almost to questions of detail.

The last sentence coming from the Speaker, a keen political observer and a legislator of long experience, may portend a change of unusual importance and far-reaching consequences in future tariff making. I now quote from the text of President Hoover's call to boom trade, November 16, 1929, the following sentence:

The establishment of credit stability and ample capital through the Federal reserve system and the demonstration of the confidence of the administration by undertaking tax reduction with the cooperation of both political parties speak more than words.

Just why should the President call to the attention of the country that tax reduction will be undertaken "with the cooperation of both political parties"? Just why should the Democrats be consulted about tax reduction and their advice and consent sought?

According to my views, the attitude of the Democrats for the last few years on tax reduction and on the payment, or rather deferring the payment, of the national debt is much more damaging to the present and future welfare of our country and more likely to weaken the country in facing future emergencies than their attitude during the same period of years on the tariff question.

Now, a few observations of my own on the practice of excluding the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee from participation in framing tariff legislation. It is said that the minority members are excluded from the framing of tariff bills so that the majority do not have to share any of the glory with the minority.

That same argument will apply to any other legislative activity. The Appropriations Committee, for instance, is a great aid to the administration's economy program. Why not exclude the minority from the framing of appropriation bills so that the majority can get full credit? The Invalid Pensions Committee, the Pensions Committee, and the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee have to do with the pensions, compensation, and welfare of all ex-service men. Everybody knows it is a great political asset to have the good will of the veterans of former wars. Here is a place to make a ten-strike by excluding the minority and thus let the majority appropriate all the glory for beneficent veterans' legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Let me finish this; I would rather complete this part of my address first. The gentleman will pardon me. I want to get through.

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. RAMSEYER. We have a large country engaged in producing different kinds of products. Different agricultural products are grown in widely separated regions based on climatic and soil conditions. The location of the different industries, East, West, North, and South, is determined by proximity of raw material and markets, labor conditions, transportation facilities, both rail and water, and by other causes. Every nook and corner of the country is affected by our tariff laws.

Agriculture, industry, and labor in every section of our common country have a vital interest in every proposal to alter or revise those tariff laws. I can not understand the mental make-up of anyone who will contend that, by adhering to this 50-year-old practice of Democratic origin, the exclusion of any section or group or interest through their Representatives in Congress from participation in writing tariff bills contributes either to orderly procedure or to the public welfare.

Let us look facts squarely in the face.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes. The gentleman is on the Committee on Ways and Means; I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I thoroughly agree with my friend that both parties in the past have been equally guilty in excluding minority members from the deliberations of the committee in framing tariff bills. If the whole membership should participate they would render a distinct service. I wish to say that not in a sense of partisanship. In the last revision of the tariff, the pending Hawley bill, there was not a single member from the entire South participating to present their views. Fifteen Republican members of the majority composed the bill, and there was not a single voice from the South on the committee to present their views. I think that is an argument carrying out my friend's suggestion.

Mr. RAMSEYER. As I stated before, my purpose is to bring about sensible, open, candid, fair conditions for framing tariff bills in the future. The gentleman from Georgia anticipated what I was about to say.

On the Ways and Means Committee there are now 10 Democrats, 6 are from that vast expanse of our country with great

and varied agricultural and industrial interests south of the Ohio River. All that region had no voice in the framing of the pending tariff bill. Now, do not understand me as even intimating that the Republicans did not go the limit in giving the South everything that was needed under the evidence. The fact remains that those on the committee with the most intimate knowledge of the needs and conditions of the South had no voice in determining any tariff rate on the products of that section of the country.

Suppose the Democrats were in control, then you would have the situation where those with the most intimate knowledge of and best qualified to speak for the agricultural and industrial products of the North and East were excluded from participation in the writing of a tariff bill. How long shall we cling to an evil practice of none too honorable an origin, that has nothing to commend itself except that it is 50 years old? Who will defend this practice that has been unsparingly condemned for 50 years by the leaders of each of the two great parties every time their party was in the minority and the majority enforced the practice of excluding them?

I know some of you think the South should send Republicans to Congress. Well, we now have a few Republicans from the South and may have more in the future. But there we face a situation and not a theory. The South has clung to the Democratic Party not on principle alone but for historic reasons chiefly. The chief center of strength of the Democratic Party is the South. I am not to-day devising ways and means to proselyte the South. What concerns me is that the South is a vital part of our country. Its prosperity and the contentment of its people are necessary for the prosperity and the contentment of the whole country. For this reason, if for no other, no committee of Congress should be deprived of the help and intimate knowledge of all its members on any legislative proposal which vitally affects the prosperity, contentment, and happiness of all the people.

I apprehend the Democrats started this practice of excluding the minority because the majority was fearful that in executive sessions a few of the majority might join with the minority to put the brakes on some pet item or pet theory of an influential majority member. Most legislation that afterwards is regretted by the people would probably have been prevented if there had been a little more application of the brakes when the legislation was being framed in committee. If the minority had sat in with their feet on the brakes when the tariff laws of 1894 and 1913 were framed, there would have been less to be sorry for and the people would have suffered less distress. If there had been more resistance in committee when the tariff law of 1909 was written the history of our country during the last 20 years might have been quite different. If the braking squad had been a little more numerous when the present tariff bill was written that bill probably would have been law months ago, instead of becoming law months hence, if ever.

My judgment is there never was any justification for the practice of excluding the minority from participation in tariff making. Even though the views of the two parties are irreconcilable, the participation of the minority in framing tariff bills, as is the practice on all other kinds of bills, would at least deprive minority members of the occasion to indulge in dark insinuations, of charging ulterior purposes or that in secret one group had been favored and another group had been discriminated against, and in consuming time and filibustering under the pretext of getting the facts or exposing the motives and purposes of the majority. The abolition of this practice would reduce to a minimum the horseplay, the politics, the insincerity, and the demagoguery that at times have attended tariff making in the past.

We were all sent here by our constituents for the one great purpose—to promote the common good. However widely we may differ on the tariff or other public questions, we owe it to our constituents and to our country to deal with each other frankly and honestly and in the open and above board.

There is in fact no more reason for excluding minority members from participation in framing tariff bills than there is for excluding minority members from participation in framing internal revenue bills or any other kind of bills. Take it for granted the minority on tariff bills will contribute nothing but criticism. If the minority is composed of rational human beings, such criticism should be constructive and therefore helpful and valuable. It is just as important—and certainly no more difficult to face in executive sessions of the committee—to have that criticism while the bill is being written as it is to have that criticism while the bill is being considered in the House or the Senate. In order that there may be no possible misunderstanding of my position on the practice of excluding minority members from participation in writing tariff bills, I assert that that

practice can not be defended from any political, moral, economic, parliamentary, legal, or constitutional standpoint.

In conclusion permit me to present certain tariff views of two great Republican authorities on the American protective system—the first Republican President and the present Republican occupant of the White House. Mr. Lincoln in a letter to a friend, dated October 11, 1859, said:

* * * I was an old Henry Clay tariff Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject [the tariff] than on any other. I have not since changed my views. I believe yet if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted, protective tariff, so far acquiesced in as to not be a perpetual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us. * * *

President Hoover, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1929, said:

* * * The exhaustive inquiries and valuable debate from men representative of all parts of the country which is needed to determine the detailed rates must necessarily be accomplished in the Congress. * * *

* * * There is no fundamental conflict between the interests of the farmer and the worker. Lowering of the standards of living of either tends to destroy the other. The prosperity of one rests upon the well-being of the other. Nor is there any real conflict between the East and the West or the North and the South in the United States. The complete interlocking of economic dependence, the common striving for social and spiritual progress, our common heritage as Americans, and the infinite web of national sentiment, have created a solidarity in a great people unparalleled in all human history. These invisible bonds should not and can not be shattered by differences of opinion growing out of discussion of a tariff. * * *

I heartily indorse these tariff views of the first Republican President and of the present Republican President, and I commend these views for your approval with the hope that they may become the chart and compass in the further consideration of the pending tariff bill and of future tariff bills. [Applause.]

Now, I come to the second portion of my address on procedure when the tariff bill comes over. Yesterday morning when I noticed in the paper that the Senate had about concluded with the tariff bill, I thought a few general observations on procedure might be timely. I do not intend to discuss now the rates in the Senate amendments.

First, I want you to understand that the issue before the Congress is not whether we shall have a free trade bill or a tariff for revenue only bill, as against a protective tariff bill. We are now on a protective-tariff basis. Some Members think that the tariff law of 1922 is the best tariff law that was ever enacted. Anyone who has made a study of that law will admit there are some defects in the law that should be remedied. The tariff bill which will come before the House in a few days is a protective tariff bill, and, as I have stated on a number of occasions previously, the new tariff bill, as far as the farmers of the Corn and Wheat Belts are concerned, will be judged as to whether it gives, on the whole, more advantages to agriculture than the present tariff law. That is the issue.

As far as I know there has been no effort made by the Democratic Members either in this Chamber or in the other Chamber, to substitute for the pending bill a free trade bill or a tariff for revenue only bill. The different coalitions in the Senate have been for protection differing only as to details.

When this bill was before the House a group of us sought to have separate votes on a number of items, and, so far as could be determined in the course of conversations among ourselves, the leaders on our side were not only reconciled to a course of that kind, but they appeared to be enthusiastic for such a course. But there were developments, the details of which I am not going to take the time to discuss. The result was that the leaders chose to take the easy course, the course of least resistance, rather than the right course, which would probably have meant a fight. If we had had separate votes in the House and 7 or 8 or 9 items in the tariff bill had been voted out by this House, the chances are that the tariff bill would have met with very little resistance in the other body. The items which were most objectionable to us were the items that received the condemnation of the people generally and of nearly every newspaper in the country. A few of those items have been corrected in the Senate, and others have not. The question will be before us in a few days, whether we, as Members of this House, representing the various constituencies, should make an earnest effort to secure the gains acquired over there, from our standpoint, and get an expression to that effect by this House.

As I stated before, there have been coalitions in the Senate. I am not going to criticize either coalition. You know my sympathies were with one of them, but you from other sections

of the country may have a different conception of what should go into a tariff bill. I am going to leave you to your own opinions. Some time later, if opportunity presents itself, I shall undertake to discuss the Senate amendments in detail.

As to procedure, when the tariff bill is messaged over, the ordinary course would be for some one to ask unanimous consent to send it to conference. Under the circumstances, that will probably be objected to and should be objected to. The next step, under the custom years ago, when objection is made, the bill will go to the Ways and Means Committee, where the Senate amendments will be considered. It will then be reported to the House and placed on the Union Calendar, and the Senate amendments considered one by one in the Committee of the Whole. The question on each Senate amendment will be, "Shall the Senate amendment be disagreed to?" or "Shall the Senate amendment be concurred in?" or "Shall the Senate amendment be concurred in with an amendment?"

Then, after the Committee of the Whole shall have completed consideration of the bill, the bill will be reported to the House for action by the House, after which a motion will be in order to send the bill to conference.

Now, the chances are there will be a rule. The rule may take different forms. It may be a rule to send the bill unconditionally to conference. If that carries, of course it goes. If such a rule is not carried the bill would go to the Committee on Ways and Means and the same procedure would be in order that I have just outlined to you.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman is mistaken in making the last statement that if the rule is not adopted, the bill goes to the Ways and Means Committee. If you vote down the previous question, then the rule can be amended so that you would have an opportunity to consider each one of the schedules in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to this, but I have been waiting now for 10 days to bring an appropriation bill before the House, and I will have to object to any further requests for time to address the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Iowa explain to the House the effect of voting down the previous question; that the House could then amend the rule and permit consideration of the Senate amendments in the House or in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I supposed that was clear to Members of the House. If a rule is brought in to send the bill unconditionally to conference, and the previous question is voted down, any amendment to the rule will be in order, on procedure or as to votes, or as to consideration of all or part of the Senate amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If the previous question is not voted down, it may be possible that Members of this House would never have an opportunity to express themselves on some of the particularly preferential schedules with which many of us are in disagreement. Is that not true?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is a possibility.

Now we may as well look the facts in the face. We already know who are going to be the conferees. There are some items that are going to be in conference which the conferees, because of their geographical location, should not want to assume the responsibility of deciding, and if they crave such responsibility, should not be permitted to do so.

Shingles is one of those items. Cement is another. Sugar is another; and let me tell you if the increase on sugar is going to raise havoc at all it is going to raise more havoc in the Northeast than in any other part of the country. I am not saying you should vote for or against an increase on sugar, but if I were one of the conferees, and peculiarly situated as some of these conferees are, I would not want to be embarrassed with having the final say. The conferees should welcome the opportunity to present these items to the House for decision. If crude oil should be in the Senate bill, I do not think the gentleman from Texas should be permitted to decide whether a duty should go on crude oil because of the peculiar interest of his State in that item. It ought to come to the House and the House given the opportunity to decide that issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There are only six or eight of these really controversial matters, are there not?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, according to my view, I should say around eight highly controverted items.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Eight would cover them all?

Mr. RAMSEYER. We will not differ on that much.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is there any reason in the world that the gentleman can think of which would make it impossible for the membership of this body, knowing what those controversial items are, to agree upon a motion that there should be votes upon them, so that the Members of this body can record themselves and so we in the House can decide what sort of a tariff bill we want to support, rather than having it settled by the conference committee and then whether we think it right or not be compelled to vote the whole thing up or down.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interpose a question before the gentleman proceeds?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not that question rest primarily with the Committee on Rules?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, I do not know about that. The gentleman from South Dakota raises a point which goes right at the complexion of this House and we might as well talk about it out loud.

Now, on this side of the aisle you have sugar Democrats; you have oil Democrats; you have shingle Democrats; you have shoe Democrats; and you have cement Democrats.

Mr. RANKIN. And Democrats!

Mr. RAMSEYER. And Republicans can be given group labels. I do not know what the outcome will be if these matters should be presented to the House, because you possibly could make combinations here just as they have done in the other body. One thing of a political nature I want to impress on you is that if the tariff bill is going to be injected into politics this fall it will be because of some of the items I have named. In 1909 it was Schedule K. It will not be Schedule K this time. It may be sugar, it may be shoes; and it may be something else. Some claim that the people have already lost all interest in this tariff bill.

Even though that be true that does not relieve us of our responsibility to get the best kind of a tariff bill we can to promote the business and welfare of the country.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield on the question of procedure?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Is it not true that if a rule is brought in and the previous question should be voted down, it would be in order to offer an amendment providing that the 8 or 10 schedules to which the gentleman has referred shall be considered and the House given an opportunity to vote on them, and if a majority of the House desires that privilege is it not within their power to accomplish it by voting down the previous question and adopting an amendment to the rule authorizing the consideration of those schedules and the House given an opportunity to vote on them?

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is no question about the power. The only question is whether you can get the Members to exercise that power.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman is more persuasive than I am, and I hope his speech will have that effect.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, I want to conclude. There are some people who seem to think that if we get the tariff on a sensible and equitable basis and out of politics there will not be any issue to divide the parties. Well, I do not know whether the tariff issue is much of an element in dividing the parties now or not. We have, of course, some great problems before the country. The tariff is one of them and prohibition is another, but in the few minutes I have remaining I want to call your attention to a problem that transcends the problems I have just named; in fact, before the problem I am about to call to your attention prohibition and the tariff fade into insignificance.

Mr. GARNER. May I interrupt to ask a question before the gentleman goes to that issue?

Mr. RAMSEYER. My time is going.

Mr. GARNER. I have already gotten the gentleman 20 additional minutes. Does the gentleman favor voting down the previous question, under the circumstances, and the House being given an opportunity to consider these schedules?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Now, Mr. GARNER, let us not get into that now. I have pointed out the procedure. If we get into matters of detail now we may have the same kind of a scene we had here last Thursday, and the first thing we know we will be

ha-ha-ing at each other. The gentleman knows I usually vote my convictions. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Well, the Rules Committee can bring in the kind of a rule I speak of if they want to.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, now, I have pointed out what should be accomplished, and I know the gentleman will watch me with an eagle eye to see what my course will be.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman knows that the Rules Committee may bring in that sort of a rule.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Certainly.

Mr. COLE. So we will not have to cross that bridge.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Certainly. We are talking about possible courses of procedure and what the results should be. And do not worry. The Rules Committee will hear about the discussion that has taken place here before they will ever take any action.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I just want to ask if the gentleman would recommend that we hold a caucus and determine that those eight controversial matters shall be mentioned in the rule we get, so that we may have a vote on them in the House? We can do that, of course, and endeavor to decide that before the rule is brought in.

Mr. RAMSEYER. We tried the caucus once and did not get very far.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think we could caucus on that without any trouble.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know about that. I do not care to commit myself on that course either just at this time.

Now, here is the problem I started to present when I was interrupted. I am going to read from a report made by Mr. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, in 1921, as chairman of the President's Conference on Unemployment. We have a situation to-day a good deal like we had in 1921. I read from his report:

There is no economic failure so terrible in its import as that of a country possessing a surplus of every necessity of life in which numbers, willing and anxious to work, are deprived of these necessities. It simply can not be if our moral and economic system is to survive. * * *

What our people wish is the opportunity to earn their daily bread, and surely in a country with its warehouses bursting with surpluses of food, of clothing, with its mines capable of indefinite production of fuel, with sufficient housing for comfort and health, we possess the intelligence to find solution. Without it our whole system is open to serious charges of failure.

To my mind, the President of the United States is the greatest practical economic engineer in the world to-day. [Applause.] He then had, and still has, a vision of things as they should be.

Do you know that we, as a people, have not yet learned the A B Cs of living together on an equitable, economic basis? This is a problem, young men, that is more important than the tariff. It is more important than prohibition. It is a problem that the tariff alone or prohibition alone or the tariff and prohibition combined will not solve. This problem is before us. It is lying right now on our front doorsteps. Have we the intelligence to find a solution?

When the Master was on earth he once said that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." You who understand the significance of this saying will understand me when I say that the industrial system should be made for man and not man for the industrial system. [Applause.]

Now, here is the problem that challenges the intelligence of both Republicans and Democrats. Here is a problem that not only should be solved but must be solved. Our warehouses bursting with surpluses of food, our storehouses filled with clothing, yet we have masses of people in this country going hungry for want of food and cold for want of clothing. Have we the intelligence to find the solution?

I hope that all of you now listening to me will address yourselves to the solution of this great problem called to the attention of the country by no less a person than President Hoover when he was Secretary of Commerce back in 1921.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, I conclude, and I thank you sincerely for your close attention to my address. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LETTS). Under the special order of the House, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] for 30 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, as the time is limited and we have been served with notice that no extension will be allowed, I ask to be permitted to proceed without interruption until I have completed my statement. After that, if I can get time, I will answer any questions, no matter how long it may take;

and let me say at this time that it is a singular fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER], who has just spoken, has taken a text very largely along the line as my own, based, I assume, upon the remarks of the gentleman from New York, which alone have caused me to take the floor this afternoon. I was not present when my colleague from New York, Doctor CROWTHER, is reported to have denounced Republicans in the House who may not vote according to his views. The RECORD states they are called "pseudo Republicans" by the gentleman from New York.

Before expressing any opinion on the tariff bill I have waited for final action by the Senate unmoved by criticisms from those who threaten for or against that or any other bill. Long experience has taught me that threats or abuse do not weigh with colleagues or constituents, who decide upon the record, and do not give ear to critics who attempt outside or inside the Chamber to influence votes in this body by threats. My own course will be determined when called upon to act.

I respect those who differ from me on the tariff, even if they would place an embargo tariff on every item in the bill. Their judgment may be bad, but if honest in opinion, that is their right, and their presence here means that they must represent the opinions of constituents who send them here.

I believe, however, that any Member of Congress who votes for or against any bill because of threats or fear of ridicule, or who surrenders his opinions to any supposed leader, thereby becomes a pseudo Representative of Congress, to use my colleague's expression, because he does not carry out his own convictions or perform a plain legislative duty. Every Member must be the keeper of his own conscience.

Mr. Speaker, on my reassignment to the Ways and Means Committee during consideration of the pending tariff bill, I refrained from any public discussion of the bill beyond a few observations on the sugar schedule, that, in my judgment, was being raised to an unconscionable figure by the House bill.

Opportunity for amendment in the House would have prevented a tariff rate of \$3 per hundred pounds placed in the bill by the committee. Cuban sugar, which furnishes one-half of our total supply, was raised by the House from \$1.76 to \$2.40 per hundred pounds, or over 36 per cent increase in the tariff on sugar. The House would never have voted that increase if it could have acted on the sugar schedule separately.

COST OF INCREASED SUGAR TARIFF

Any sugar tariff increase is closely reflected in price, because five-sixths of our sugar is imported, so a sugar increase for 120,000,000 consumers, who use 12,000,000,000 pounds annually, can be fairly well ascertained. That rate and others equally unjust I hoped would be rejected by the Senate when we passed the bill on to that body.

Rates adopted by the Senate have been reported in the RECORD debates and as a member of the House Committee somewhat familiar with tariff-making on two great bills, I bear testimony that the Senate has given weeks of careful consideration to the bill, where the House gave hours and, and at least it has legislated where we employed a brief time in the House with idle speech-making.

A final trade on different schedules seems to have left little to choose from between many of the rates adopted by the two Houses, and as the conferees are bound by the lowest rates adopted by the Senate, and by the House rates that in some cases hold the sky the limit, the situation is not promising from the consumer's standpoint.

A discussion by colleagues on the committee last week appears in the RECORD wherein one political leader called the tariff pot procedure black, although political leaders of his own party had given the same color under a different procedure. Leaders on one side were blamed because they prevented any submission of tariff rates to the House, while the other side only submitted the tariff bill to its followers after binding them by caucus to oppose any floor amendment to the House bill, from responsibility for the action of any Member because we all know that the individual is responsible for his own act and his own vote and Members must be held responsible for their own acts. The seal mentioned by my colleague from New York that regularly begs for the loaves and fishes from his master, is a living monument to "regularity" at feeding time, but will not be compared by me to any Member either before or after election.

Mr. Speaker, no tariff bill will ever be entirely satisfactory to anyone, because such bills are always filled with compromises. Every State and every community gets all it can for its local industry to the point of a tariff embargo and devil take the great multitude of consumers who have no industries to trade.

NO TARIFF AMENDMENTS PERMITTED

As has already been stated, no Member of the House, apart from Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee,

had any direct voice in a single paragraph of the 1930 tariff bill's preparation or passage. Even committee members radically disagreed among themselves on many items. So much, I believe, can be fairly said of the 435 Members of the House, for only 15 members of the committee prepared the bill that was passed without a single amendment by the House.

Not one amendment to rates could be offered under the rule. In the past I have strenuously opposed gag rules that frequently reduce the House to a helpless, inarticulate legislative body. Any rule that gives a committee power to fix tariff rates without review by the House is a rule that aids special interests to control rates and is against the public interest. [Applause.]

What was the effect of preparing a bill in this manner and what did it invite? I will offer only one or two illustrations to indicate the weakness of the present system.

In the case of Schedule 5, affecting sugar, which to my mind is a most objectionable rate in the pending bill, the chairman of the sugar subcommittee was the one Member of the House most vitally interested of all Members in writing a high tariff rate on sugar, because more than one-quarter of all the domestic beet sugar produced in the United States is manufactured in his district. I offer this statement without reflection upon my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, but to disclose how such procedure results with the bill.

In the RECORD of May 13, page 1232, a detailed statement has been set forth to show that this one company on an original investment of \$15,000,000 returned \$156,000,000 in dividends or over 40 per cent annual profit on the original investment, and this company is the greatest beneficiary in the country of the proposed 36 per cent sugar increase contained in the House bill. State and Federal official reports denounced Mexican women and child labor in these Colorado beet fields. All this data I will offer hereafter in support of the statement.

Yet, with all these facts before the House the committee report of 36 per cent increase on sugar, and on every other schedule was adopted without change of a comma or a single figure in reported tariff rates. The increased burden so laid on sugar consumers by the House bill was estimated to reach from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 annually, and a most discouraging situation is developed when it is understood the increase will be of little value to domestic beet-sugar industries because free-island imports have more than doubled over our own beet-sugar production in less than a decade. The 36 per cent increased tariff will further stimulate free-island production so as to hasten destruction of this hothouse industry that can only be saved by a bounty.

RULES THAT PREVENT INTELLIGENT LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, under a rule adopted by the House, the committee bill was sent to the Senate by a vote in which every Member either rejected or swallowed the bill as a whole. Trusting that the Senate would legislate and correct many injustices even as it had adopted over 2,000 amendments to the preceding Fordney tariff bill, many Members voted to send the bill to the Senate for that purpose.

I am not here discussing the reasons why the House gagged itself and refused to permit any amendments to the committee bill, but am offering a simple statement of fact concerning tariff legislation that effects the whole economic life of the country and lays an additional burden of hundreds of millions of dollars on the backs of American consumers. The responsibility for such surrender of legislative duties rests on every Member of the House.

Others may attempt to distinguish between a tariff bill that is now supported irrespective of political lines and appropriation bills aggregating thousands of items and several billions of dollars passed upon by the House and which receive consideration every session.

Neither this attempted distinction nor the present method of tariff bill preparation by the House will be further discussed in the few moments I am permitted to give to the subject, for we are now more concerned in the situation which confronts us than in reasons which have brought it about.

Parliamentary restrictions prevent any discussion of the tariff bill's journey through the Senate or whether the preparation of schedules and passage over there differed from those which have occurred in the House. The RECORD contains many charges by Members of the other body of logrolling and trading, common to tariff bills, including 6 votes on oil, but each House must accept its own responsibility for results.

The conferees are soon to pass upon the rates fixed by each House and, as stated, neither higher nor lower rates than the extremes adopted in one House or the other can be fixed by the final bill. Bound by that rule it is doubtful if the conferees can report any measure that will be preferable to existing law. Some rates are highly desirable and would be quite generally

supported by the membership of both Houses, but others can be pointed out that have little or no justification for increases.

Mr. Speaker, President Hoover called a special session largely to correct existing tariff inequalities, among which he named agricultural relief. The distressing situation disclosed by agriculture as a whole compared with other industries requires no illustrations at this time, and the President acting on what he believed to be a mandate from the people asked us to carry out that mandate. He did not suggest any general tariff revision or any embargo on foreign products that would add to the existing heavy burdens of consumers, including farmers, who will pay \$100 or more increased sugar burdens for every dollar that gets to the pocket of any actual sugar-beet farmer.

THE GOLD-BRICK WHEAT AND CEMENT TARIFF

Raising the wheat tariff rate to 42 cents per bushel and then leaving the American wheat grower to compete with Bolsheviks of Russia and natives of Argentina in the Liverpool market is a boasted feature of the pending bill that ostensibly promises protection to the farm. As passed by the House the tariff increase is a gold brick that would convict any stock gambler of fraud if left to the average jury. Yet, we do just that when in 1929 we produced around 900,000,000 bushels of wheat and imported only 36,263 bushels that could possibly be subjected to a 42-cent per bushel duty. The wheat tariff does not help the farmer one penny, as farmers well know.

In 1929 the domestic cement industry produced 117,000,000 barrels of cement with imports of about 2,000,000 barrels, or 2 per cent of the total used in the country.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is the gentleman talking about 1929?

Mr. FREAR. Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine.

Mr. RAMSEYER. According to a late statement the imports in 1929 was only 1.01.

Mr. FREAR. If so, it is less than I supposed; and on 117,000,000 barrels, it will reflect the increased tariff because all companies charge the same price for cement. I now learn that domestic cement production in 1929 was 170,198,000 barrels and only 1,720,273 imported, or 1 per cent. That is a monumental travesty under the name of "protection." A tariff of 8 cents on cement in the House bill, including containers, or 6 cents per hundred pounds in the Senate bill now taken off the tariff free list will place hundreds of millions of dollars in new burdens hereafter largely on agriculture that is engaged in building cement highways to gridiron every State. Do not forget that around 40 cents increase per barrel written in a tariff bill, supposedly to aid farmers, reflects an increased price on the entire 170,000,000 barrels of cement depending only on the soft-heartedness of the Cement Trust.

THE CEMENT MONOPOLY'S TARIFF

The pending tariff bill will increase heavy burdens by the cement monopoly, which furnishes to every purchaser at a fixed price all the cement used on our public highways. Its effect on the market is shown when Penn-Dixie cement, with 14,000,000 shares of stock, is reported to have jumped its common stock over 25 per cent in value when the Senate acted on cement.

The Senate Record of Saturday, March 22, disclosed in detail how a distressed cement concern—the North American Co.—now pleading for a high tariff, jumped its capitalization within 24 hours in 1925 from \$5,654,131 to \$12,425,985. To support this high financing, alleged to represent over 100 per cent watered stock, cement consumers will now pay increased profits because of the cement tariff. High financing is responsible for much real or pretended business distress the tariff is called upon to cure.

Sugar stocks, brick, glass, and other stocks, because of tariff rates, have enormously increased profits to stockholders as rapidly as these rates have been acted upon. Do not forget that all these profits are derived from increased prices to be paid by the consumers.

The sundries schedule was raised about 40 per cent over existing law by the House committee bill, and the House again refused to consider a single item of scores of items thus raised. Forty per cent increase over what? Over the highest tariff rates ever written in this country on articles the farmer and all other consumers use and must pay, including the added price. The Senate felt ashamed of these rates and reduced the House rate over 26 per cent. Over \$318,000,000 in sundries, or far more than all agricultural products combined, were imported into this country in 1928, and that does not limit the scope of the tariff increase price which will be reflected in many times that amount of products by domestic manufacturers who will equally profit by any increased prices.

A fifth vote last Friday on oil in the Senate, if adopted, would have included every farmer's gasoline engine, with a general in-

crease annually estimated to reach hundreds of millions of dollars. It was barely defeated by a vote of 37 to 36, or 1 majority. By such scientific methods has the 1930 tariff bill been constructed, aided by a new coalition model but equipped with weakened shock absorbers.

These illustrations in accepted or rejected schedules could be extended to many other items in the bill as thus far acted upon, but I submit that the farmer, who, based on proportionate population, pays one-fourth of all tariff increases, may believe from such facts he is burdened far beyond any benefits to be derived under a bill originally designed for his special relief.

The question then resolves itself into the proposition, Will increased tariff rates, or other proposals, benefit industries enough to offset increased burdens placed upon consumers?

The Senate adopted a debenture proposal to allow one-half of the tariff fixed in the bill to certain surplus exported commodities. This proposition is declared to be economically unsound by reputable leaders, yet we load increased price burdens of sugar, cement, glass, and countless other products onto the consumer with a straight face and aid price fixing by monopoly through rates fixed by increased tariffs that discount any wheat debenture proposal.

NO POLITICAL TARIFF LINES CAN BE DRAWN

Represented by powerful lobbies and widespread propaganda many protected industries have profited by the new situation which has occurred when tariff walls no longer separate political parties. The cane sugar of Louisiana and citrus fruit of Florida and wool of Texas and other southern products are all in the same tariff wagon now with the protected industries of the North and East.

Objections have been ignored that the 1930 tariff bill contains by far the highest tariff rates ever adopted by Congress and that these rates in many cases amount to an embargo. No importations from other countries will occur when an embargo prevents any exchange of products, nor does it afford opportunity for such other countries to pay their debts of more than \$16,000,000,000 to this country.

A serious economic situation occurs when organized domestic monopoly is able through price fixing to extort increased profits from American consumers due to tariff embargoes. Practically every Member favors adequate protection for American industry, but this embargo protection is not approved by either political party platform when it affords legalized extortion.

The tariff bill seems to have broken away from the direction of party leaders. It has run wild and is soon to go to the conferees. Will the House seek to express its judgment on any items it has never yet considered. That we are about to determine. Not by any coalition between political parties, but by individual judgment of a majority of 435 House Members, who have thus far refused to act on any of its provisions.

If the President vetoes the bill that is finally agreed upon by the conferees he will be confronted with political responsibility for the results, yet no one can truthfully claim he could have anticipated or desired results that may be reached by the tariff bill which finally will be sent for his approval.

The House bill gave greatly added powers to the Tariff Commission under the flexible tariff provision. The Senate sought to have Congress retain its constitutional powers over customs by restricting tariff changes to single schedules rather than leave changes to the Executive whose tariff advisers he appoints, and who under the new flexible tariff powers are delegated to carry out duties enjoined upon Congress by the Constitution. These amendments, unless acted on by the House, leave the conferees to determine whether a tariff commission is a better body to fix tariff rates than Congress. It is a large responsibility if so decided, even for the able conferees who are to be appointed.

Mr. Speaker, if I differ from my colleagues on the committee, I accord them equally sincere motives and voice my appreciation for the many days of arduous work given by our committee in preparation of the bill. They have worked morning and night trying to determine schedule rates and effect agreements. It requires far more effort to disagree from colleagues whose judgment is expressed by compromises reached in the House bill than in any other decision on ordinary legislation, but Members are here to act on their own responsibility.

Without needless discussion I have briefly presented a situation that to my mind confronts Members at this time. Party regularity is a slogan and the question for each to determine is whether the bill, as finally reported, can be successfully defended or whether a comparative handful of producers, some of whom confront serious business handicaps will enable all other producers to reap increased profits from the great army of consumers whom we equally represent.

PROTECTION OR PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPORTS

If left to the House, I believe the tariff bill would have been greatly improved before it passed to the Senate. An incorrect theory is apparent in its preparation when it attempts to save a few freight rate or otherwise handicapped or poorly managed sugar, cement, and other industries by increased duties reaching to an embargo. That is a fundamental difference between a protectionist who believes in aiding our home industries and a tariff prohibitionist who would prohibit all imports in order to protect the weakest and most hopeless in any industry.

Such tariff increases for weak business permit efficiently and profitably conducted industries to reap largely increased profits from consumers who pay all the profits. On the other hand, the consumer's problem to-day equally confronts those with a reduced pay envelope and the average farmer who is struggling harder than ever before to face the tax collector.

I do not question the high purposes of my committee colleagues at the outset in seeking to produce a just protection-tariff measure. Even their efforts were subject to many conflicting demands from rival claimants over hundreds of items, but what of the handwork through trading and logrolling of warring coalitions, of combinations, and forced compromises that may eventually carry a billion dollars of increased annual costs to the consumer for protection.

Every Member has his individual responsibility, and as one who has sought to give study to the 1930 tariff proposals and also to follow discussions in the Senate, I submit that it is for those who indorse these heavy tariff increases to show how the final bill will improve general business. To my mind the House bill, and in some respects the Senate bill, places on consumers new and heavy burdens that will lessen their purchasing power and so prevent any promised benefit to either consumers or producers.

Instead of helping to bring about general prosperity it rather tends to widen the breach that now exists between those who garner in larger profits and those who must tighten their belts to meet conditions imposed by the bill. This much can be said on the progress of the bill to date, but to express any further views on any measure not before us or before it has left the hands of the Senate would, in my judgment, be premature. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman has described the parliamentary situation accurately; but what disturbs me at this time is this, that no matter what kind of a parliamentary situation is created there will be such combinations between different sections of the country that the consumers are going to get it. It happened in the House and it happened in the Senate, and so very little relief for the consumers is in sight.

Mr. FREAR. One thing my colleague forgets is what occurred in the Republican conference, but, like all others, he can not express himself on that. Whatever occurs will have to be done on the floor of the House.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. I would like to ask the gentleman if whatever occurred in the conference is executive?

Mr. FREAR. I would consider it so.

Mr. GARNER. I wonder if the gentleman from New York will give us the opportunity for log rolling possibilities in the House as they had in the Senate.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will say that we were lifted up to the highest peak of hope—

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman give us an opportunity by helping to give us a record vote?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman seems to think that I am running this side of the House, and I am not.

Mr. GARNER. I asked the gentleman if he would join to give us the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Members for their attention. [Applause.] Under leave to extend I submit the following:

Summary by schedules of actual or computed ad valorem rates of duty in the tariff bill, H. R. 2667, as passed by the House of Representatives and as agreed to by the Senate up to and including March 13, 1930

Title	Per cent		Senate changes, per cent		Relation of Senate changes to House bill, per cent	
	House	Senate	Increase	Decrease	Increase	Decrease
1. Chemicals, oils, and paints.....	32.10	30.52	-----	1.58	-----	4.9
2. Earthenware, earthenware, and glassware.....	54.45	52.47	-----	1.98	-----	3.6
3. Metals and manufactures of.....	36.34	32.66	-----	3.68	-----	10.0
4. Wood and manufactures of.....	23.34	15.65	-----	9.69	-----	38.0
5. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of.....	92.36	77.16	-----	15.20	-----	16.4
6. Tobacco and manufactures of.....	66.96	63.09	-----	3.87	-----	5.7
7. Agricultural products and provisions.....	33.35	35.91	2.56	-----	7.6	-----
8. Spirits, wines, and other beverages.....	47.44	47.44	Same.	Same.	-----	-----
9. Manufactures of cotton.....	43.58	38.15	-----	5.43	-----	12.4
10. Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of.....	19.27	18.97	-----	.30	-----	1.5
11. Wool and manufactures of.....	58.07	57.09	-----	.98	-----	1.6
12. Manufactures of silk.....	60.17	58.03	-----	2.14	-----	3.5
13. Manufactures of rayon.....	53.09	53.68	.59	-----	1.1	-----
14. Paper and books.....	26.14	25.91	-----	.23	-----	.87
15. Sundries.....	28.56	20.88	-----	7.68	-----	26.8

Summary by schedules of rates of duty in the tariff act of 1913, the tariff act of 1922, and bill H. R. 2667 as passed by the House of Representatives and as reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee with subsequent changes by the Senate Committee of the Whole, and as further agreed to by the Senate up to and including March 13, 1930—Schedules 1 to 15

Schedule	Article	Value of imports, calendar year 1923	Computed duties on 1928 imports						Actual or computed ad valorem rates							
			Act of 1913	Act of 1922	H. R. 2667				Act of 1913	Act of 1922	H. R. 2667				As passed the House of Representatives	As reported by Senate Finance Committee
					As passed the House of Representatives	As reported by Senate Finance Committee	As agreed to by Senate Committee of the Whole	As agreed to by Senate up to Mar. 13, 1930			As passed the House of Representatives	As reported by Senate Finance Committee	As agreed to by Senate Committee of the Whole	As agreed to by Senate up to Mar. 13, 1930		
1	Chemicals, oils, and paints.....	\$94,909,666	\$15,402,669	\$27,688,949	\$30,466,224	\$28,119,435	\$29,022,092	\$28,970,353	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.	P. d.
2	Earthenware, earthenware, and glassware.....	56,521,947	18,000,225	25,567,147	30,776,372	29,924,652	27,297,175	29,654,814	31.85	45.23	54.45	52.94	48.29	52.47	54.45	52.47
3	Metals and manufactures of.....	118,658,110	16,987,338	40,004,372	43,118,528	34,941,470	38,407,195	38,754,924	14.32	33.71	36.34	29.45	32.37	32.66	36.34	32.66
4	Wood and manufactures of.....	26,453,184	1,771,196	4,191,356	6,702,169	4,141,108	4,118,608	4,139,242	6.70	15.85	23.34	15.66	15.57	15.65	23.34	15.65
5	Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of.....	174,759,643	68,550,633	118,872,109	161,405,190	148,100,786	119,212,001	134,843,827	39.23	67.85	92.36	84.75	68.21	77.16	92.36	77.16
6	Tobacco and manufactures of.....	62,318,624	37,804,801	39,314,791	41,729,431	39,314,791	39,314,791	39,314,791	60.66	63.09	66.96	63.09	63.09	63.09	66.96	63.09
7	Agricultural products and provisions.....	266,792,553	26,249,569	50,686,019	88,981,576	80,429,586	95,597,728	95,804,790	9.84	22.37	33.35	32.40	35.83	35.91	33.35	35.91
8	Spirits, wines, and other beverages.....	1,433,616	306,198	523,045	680,069	680,069	680,069	680,069	25.54	36.48	47.44	47.44	47.44	47.44	47.44	47.44
9	Manufactures of cotton.....	49,463,049	15,097,002	19,016,340	21,557,444	21,557,036	18,870,585	18,870,585	30.52	40.26	43.58	43.58	38.15	38.15	43.58	38.15
10	Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of.....	133,207,491	13,403,944	24,191,702	25,284,930	25,724,740	26,167,622	25,433,528	10.22	18.44	19.27	19.31	19.64	18.97	19.27	18.97
11	Wool and manufactures of.....	115,180,986	23,923,150	57,171,665	66,886,360	65,468,100	65,752,262	65,752,262	20.77	49.64	58.07	56.84	57.09	57.09	58.07	57.09
12	Manufactures of silk.....	32,440,182	15,038,217	18,348,161	19,518,180	20,256,955	18,825,189	18,825,189	46.36	56.17	60.17	62.44	58.03	58.03	60.17	58.03
13	Manufactures of rayon.....	11,425,596	3,928,913	6,019,359	6,065,431	6,157,202	6,145,719	6,133,708	34.39	52.68	53.09	53.89	53.79	53.68	53.09	53.68
14	Paper and books.....	20,345,158	4,408,264	4,986,391	5,317,439	5,315,286	5,214,023	5,271,588	21.67	24.51	26.14	26.13	25.63	25.91	26.14	25.91
15	Sundries.....	316,696,350	51,441,872	66,455,927	90,440,519	83,976,993	66,121,799	66,121,799	16.24	20.98	28.56	26.52	20.88	20.88	28.56	20.88
Total, comparable items.....		1,480,605,155	312,373,991	512,637,333	638,929,862	600,108,218	560,746,856	578,571,469	21.10	34.62	43.15	40.53	37.87	30.08	43.15	30.08

Mr. FREAR. The foregoing are valuable statistics that afford comparison of rates first submitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. They disclose the extent of increases, some of which challenge attention.

EXTORTIONATE PROFITS

In support of my statement regarding the sugar schedule, I offer a detailed statement of extortionate profits made by the Great Western Sugar Co. that are almost unbelievable but are certified by able accountants. This company not only produces one-half of all the beet sugar manufactured in the country but more than half of all its mills, 16 in number, are in the district of the chairman of the House sugar subcommittee that fixed the unconscionable \$3 duty per hundred pounds on sugar.

Attention is also invited to the labor conditions in this same company's contracts with Mexican beet growers. I submit they will be found nowhere worse in the entire company. And this company is to have a 36 per cent increase in tariff rates, with proportionately increased profits, under the House bill.

PROFITS OF THE GREAT WESTERN SUGAR CO. THAT PRODUCES ONE-HALF OF OUR DOMESTIC SUGAR

A study of the financial operations of the Great Western Sugar Co. reveals an amazing story of profits and dividends of a company protected by an unduly high tariff.

When the company was organized in January, 1905, its authorized capital stock consisted of \$30,000,000, composed of \$15,000,000 7 per cent preferred stock and \$15,000,000 common stock of a par value of \$100 per share.

Of the preferred stock, \$13,630,000 was sold at the time the company was formed in 1905; the balance, \$1,370,000, was not sold until July, 1922. The company has never failed to pay 7 per cent per annum regularly on the preferred stock since its initial dividend in 1905.

No common stock was sold. One hundred and five thousand four hundred and forty shares were issued as a bonus to purchasers of preferred stock at time of organization. In December, 1916, the outstanding common stock was increased from 105,440 shares to 150,000 shares by a stock dividend of 42 per cent. In October, 1922, the par value of the common stock was reduced from \$100 to \$25 per share, and the stock split up on the basis of four new shares for one of the old. In July, 1927, the \$25 par value of the stock was changed to no par value stock and again split up on the basis of three shares for one. In other words, the original holder of one share (bonus) common stock would have 1 $\frac{42}{100}$ shares in December, 1916, 5 $\frac{27}{100}$ shares in October, 1922, and 17 shares in July, 1927. At around to-day's price (\$40, May 7, 1929) the market value of these 17 shares amounts to \$680.

While the common-share holders were profiting by stock dividends and "split up," it must not be lost sight of that they were also the beneficiaries of huge dividends, as the following table shows:

Dividends paid per share on 105,440 shares originally issued as bonus to preferred-stock purchasers

Fiscal year ending Feb. 28—	Dividends paid per share, common
1910	\$1.25
1911	5.00
1912	5.00
1913	5.00
1914	5.00
1915	5.00
1916	6.50
1917	7.46
1918	68.28
1919	66.86
1920	66.86
1921	66.86
1922	8.53
1923	5.69
1924	22.76
1925	45.53
1926	45.53
1927	45.53
1928	46.66
1929	47.80
Total	577.10

The above dividends are exclusive of the 7 per cent that was paid regularly on the preferred stock.

The total amount in dividends paid out by the company is tremendous when one considers that the actual cash investment in the company was only \$15,000,000. The average cash investment, though, is less—amounting to \$14,000,000—as the company originally started with \$13,630,000, and it was not until July, 1922, when the additional \$1,370,000 was invested by an additional sale of preferred stock.

In the period of 24 years since the company was formed it has paid out on its preferred stock a regular annual dividend of 7 per cent, or a total of \$23,521,750. In the same period it has paid out to the holders of its common stock (who received this stock as a bonus and paid nothing for it) dividends of \$60,850,660.

Or total dividends of \$84,372,410

The original 105,440 shares common stock, which were given as a bonus to preferred stockholders, have been converted into 1,800,000 shares by stock dividends and "split ups." This new stock has a market value of \$40 per share (May 7, 1929), or a total value of \$72,000,000.

Making a total profit (on an investment of \$15,000,000) of \$156,372,410

Or approximately \$1,042.48 for each \$100 invested, equivalent to an average yearly return and appreciation of \$43.43 for each \$100 invested for the past 24 years, since the company was started.

Parenthetically stated, child labor did not get any of these dividends.

The following table is illuminating as to the yearly dividends paid on the \$15,000,000 investment:

	Total dividends paid during year	Common dividends	Preferred dividends
Fiscal year ending Feb. 28—			
1906	\$954,100		\$954,100
1907	954,100		954,100
1908	954,100		954,100
1909	954,100		954,100
1910	1,085,900	\$131,800	954,100
1911	1,481,300	527,200	954,100
1912	1,481,300	527,200	954,100
1913	1,481,300	527,200	954,100
1914	1,481,300	527,200	954,100
1915	1,481,300	527,200	954,100
1916	1,639,460	685,360	954,100
1917	1,741,600	787,500	954,100
1918	8,154,100	7,200,000	954,100
1919	8,004,100	7,050,000	954,100
1920	8,004,100	7,050,000	954,100
1921	8,004,100	7,050,000	954,100
1922	1,854,100	900,000	954,100
1923	1,602,050	600,000	1,002,050
1924	3,450,000	2,400,000	1,050,000
1925	5,850,000	4,800,000	1,050,000
1926	5,850,000	4,800,000	1,050,000
1927	5,850,000	4,800,000	1,050,000
1928	5,970,000	4,920,000	1,050,000
1929	6,090,000	5,040,000	1,050,000
Total	84,372,410	60,850,660	23,521,750

It is of interest to note the tremendous rise in dividends during the fiscal years starting March 1, 1917, and ending February 28, 1921. It can be easily recalled that 1917 and 1918 were the war years. It was in 1919 when the Government released its control of sugar, and from then on into 1920 the price started to soar upward to 25 cents a pound. Not only did the price of sugar climb but the dividends paid by the company became record breaking. In the eventful year of 1920 the Great Western Sugar Co. had a net income of around \$11,500,000. This figure was exceeded in the fiscal year beginning March 1, 1917, which was the war year, when a net income of \$12,335,000 was reported.

When organized the Great Western Sugar Co. operated six beet-sugar factories with a slicing capacity of 5,600 tons of beets daily. These mills were all in the State of Colorado. To-day, the company owns and controls 21 beet-sugar factories, with a slicing capacity of 33,000 tons of beets daily. It not only operates in Colorado but has expanded into Nebraska, where it operates six mills, and in Montana and Wyoming, where it operates one factory each. From a small beginning in 1905 it now produces about 50 per cent of the entire United States beet crop. This tremendous expansion was all paid out of earnings of the company. While this expansion was going on dividends were also being paid. The expansion program continues—a new factory is being built at Wheatland, Colo., which is expected to be ready for the next season.

In the past 12 years the company has expanded from a production of around 5,000,000 bags of sugar to over 10,500,000 bags, an increase of over 100 per cent, while the entire beet-sugar industry in the United States, for a similar period, has only expanded from a production of 15,300,000 bags of sugar to 21,600,000 bags, an increase of a little over 40 per cent. To-day, as stated, the company produces about 50 per cent of all the beet sugar produced in the United States, and all this expansion was paid out of earnings of the company without affecting its generous dividend policy.

For the last 12 years, for which data is available, the Great Western Sugar Co. produced 83,796,286 bags of sugar, 100 pounds to the bag. During this same period the net income as reported by the company was \$76,405,590, or a profit per pound of 0.9118 cent. The dividends paid during this period were \$68,682,550, equivalent to 0.8196 cent per pound of sugar manufactured. The average tariff on refined sugar, in effect during the past 12 years, was 1.5997 cents per pound. Should the average tariff on refined sugar have been reduced by 0.57 cent per pound—this 0.57 cent is the reduction recommended by

the United States Tariff Commission in its report to the President—the net income of the company for the past 12 years would be reduced from \$76,405,590 to \$28,642,000, equivalent to 184 per cent on the preferred stock for the 12-year period, or a little over 15 per cent per annum. Allowing for a regular 7 per cent dividend on the preferred stock for the 12 years—\$12,600,000—there would still remain over \$16,000,000 available for the common stock, which was given as a bonus to preferred stockholders, equivalent to 106½ per cent for the 12-year period, or an annual return of 8.89 per cent on the original \$15,000,000 common stock, which was the bonus to preferred shareholders.

I asked for this detailed statement because of repeated denials of profits, child labor, and other interesting facts. I submit if this statement is correct, and I believe it to be so, then it gives a record of high financing in Colorado that is rarely equaled in this country.

Does this company that has one-half of its great mills in Chairman TIMBERLAKE's district need a higher tariff to further increase its profits of 45 per cent last year?

HERE IS A GRAPHIC STATEMENT OF PROFITS AND LOSSES

Evidence of the prosperity, or lack of it, of the leading sugar companies in Cuba, south Porto Rico, Hawaii, and in the domestic beet fields is given in the accompanying table, which was prepared from available statistics. A similar study of the Philippine companies was not made because of the unavailability of accurate information; nevertheless, it is known that the Philippine companies have enjoyed large profits.

In order to find a common ground of comparison, it was decided to take \$1,000 worth of common stock, purchased January 31, 1921, in each of the companies studied, and sold April 19, 1929. The profits and losses accruing to the buyer are calculated by taking into consideration not only the sale value of the stock but also the sale of rights and the cash dividends received.

The table shows that purchasers of—

\$3,000 worth of common stock purchased in three Cuban companies with an annual production of slightly less than 1,000,000 tons lost over the 8-year period..... \$1,450.35
\$10,000 worth of common stock purchased in the south Porto Rican, Hawaiian, and domestic companies studied made a net profit over the 8-year period of..... 10,485.15

It should be apparent from the table that the domestic beet, the Porto Rican and the Hawaiian companies, which are demanding an increase in the tariff, have prospered under the present tariff of 1.76 cents; while the Cuban companies have lost heavily as a result of this tariff.

In the accompanying table—when the stock was not listed the asked quotation was used on the date nearest to January 31, 1921.

Where no market quotation was available for the sale of rights, the theoretical figure was used.

When no sales figures were available the bid quotation of April 19, 1929, was used.

Comparison of common stocks of sugar companies

Company	Annual production	Cost Jan. 31, 1922	Sale of rights	Cash dividends received	Stock sale Apr. 19, 1929	Gain (+) or loss (-)
Cuba Cane.....	511,329	\$1,000.00	\$0.87	-----	\$163.04	-\$836.09
Cuban American.....	294,521	1,000.00	-----	\$406.78	398.31	-194.91
Punta Alegre.....	179,163	1,000.00	-----	215.05	365.60	-419.95
-----	-----	3,000.00	.87	621.83	926.95	-1,450.35
South Porto Rico.....	113,609	1,000.00	38.91	519.75	2,091.36	+1,650.00
Fajardo.....	42,586	1,000.00	4.41	1,047.06	976.47	+1,027.94
Central Aguirre Associates.....	58,744	1,000.00	-----	962.69	2,686.57	+2,649.26
-----	-----	3,000.00	43.30	2,529.50	5,754.40	+5,327.20
Great Western.....	469,520	1,000.00	-----	787.20	1,800.00	+1,587.20
Holly Sugar.....	82,080	1,000.00	-----	-----	438.20	-561.80
American Beet Sugar.....	71,363	1,000.00	5.68 ¹	227.27	363.64	-403.41
-----	-----	3,000.00	5.68	1,014.47	2,601.84	+621.99
Ewa Plantation.....	44,961	1,000.00	-----	1,153.57	1,857.14	+2,010.71
Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar.....	56,531	1,000.00	-----	636.36	1,250.00	+886.36
Hawaiian Sugar.....	26,785	1,000.00	-----	783.33	1,277.78	+1,061.11
-----	-----	3,000.00	-----	2,573.26	4,384.92	+3,958.18

¹ Farr & Co. says this company is capable of producing 26,785 long tons annually.

In all cases of production, long tons are used.

When the stock was not listed the asked quotation was used on the date nearest to Jan. 31, 1921.

Where no market quotation was available for sale of rights, the theoretical figure was used.

When no figures for sale of stock on Apr. 19, 1929, were available, the bid quotation was used.

ANOTHER COLORADO WITNESS

A Colorado letter from a former distinguished Member of Congress is received and I quote from that portion which relates to the sugar subject and to the employment of Mexicans in the sugar-beet fields by the Great Western Sugar Co., contractors in Colorado.

Therein ex-Congressman Kindel states that \$116,000 was paid by Weld County, the conspicuous child-labor county in Mr. TIMBERLAKE's district, for food supplies to indigents during the winter months. The letter is offered for what it contains.

DENVER, COLO., May 9, 1929.

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FREAR: I note with interest your attitude in the matter of the sugar tariff, and on the whole I cordially approve it. * * *

Now, as to sugar, the principal employees doing the drudgery of the beet fields in Colorado are Mexicans and other inferior foreign laborers who are lowering the standard of human values, are undertaken to be supplied by the "field man" of the Great Western Sugar Co., relative to whom an illuminating fact is that the community chest (Denver) cares, in part at least, for 8,000 Mexicans in winter and 3,000 in summer in this city, which information I gleaned from the charity organization since the receipt of your letter, and, furthermore, Weld County, which is our largest county in agricultural area, paid within one fiscal year (only a year or two ago) some \$116,000 to grocer merchants for food supplies doled out by them to indigents during the winter months, according to a statement made by Mr. Charles Finch, a prominent farmer of Eaton, Colo., to my attorney here on his visit to the stock show last January. The indigents, he said, were mainly Mexicans; and I am writing for confirmation of the statement in its entirety (of which I do not doubt).

I inclose current financial statement of the Great Western Sugar Co., which shows great opulence—in part fostered by the community charity shown—and also a monster gorging in comparison to the farm community hereabouts in general, in which connection I would state that vast areas of dry lands pay more annual taxes than same can be rented for, or otherwise made to yield. And I have definite information that a brother of Congressman GARNER, of Texas, who resides in the southern part of this State, can confirm that statement of his own personal knowledge and experience.

Under all the circumstances—of course, not pretended to be recited herein—it seems a shame, if not crime, to raise the duty on sugar; and in this connection a quotation made by Senator Reed of Missouri in his last year of service seems appropriate: "Shall statesmen vaunt their shame and call it fame?"

I glory in the fact that you continue to follow the maxim that "the greatest good to the greatest number is the supreme law." More power to you—and with the kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Cordially,

GEORGE J. KINDEL.

P. S.—As I suppose you know, much data can be had relative to laboring conditions in the beet fields from the report of Thomas J. Miller, United States Department of Labor, and also from H. L. Kerwin, director of Division of Conciliation, United States Department of Labor.

SUGAR WITNESSES FURNISHED BY MR. TIMBERLAKE

The brief of the United States Beet Sugar Association, submitted by Stephen H. Love, president, and Harry Austin, secretary, filed with the Ways and Means Committee, contradicts the statement that an increased sugar tariff will encourage greater production of sugar within continental United States.

So disproportionate are the benefits of any protective tariff which would place the American farmer on the same basis as the oriental farmer of tropical islands, even 10,000 miles away, that the domestic producer can not long continue to meet this competition, though adequately protected against other foreign nations. (Brief, p. 3333, hearings before Ways and Means Committee.)

Decline of agriculture and industry thereon dependent may easily occur within a tariff wall designed for domestic production.

For purposes of argument, it is obvious that a duty on foreign sugar might be fixed so high that the entire supply required by the United States might be produced in sources technically under the American flag from the standpoint of possession.

Under such conditions practically no sugar would be produced in continental United States, since it could be produced so much cheaper in the Philippines, and even in Hawaii or Porto Rico.

Even more definite is the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee (p. 3331) of Mr. W. D. Lippitt, vice president and general manager of the Great Western Sugar Co., who also represented the United States Beet Sugar Association at the hearings.

Asked by Congressman TIMBERLAKE whether "it was impossible to increase the production of sugar in this country to meet

our demands, regardless of what tariff was imposed," Mr. Lippitt testified:

I think that the increase in continental beet production would be relatively slow. I differ materially with many of the witnesses who have testified to-day on that point. (These witnesses asserted continental United States could, within a few years, produce all the sugar we consumed.) I doubt that any reasonable tariff would permit us to expand the industry in any reasonable period of time to supply our own requirements. I think, even under such an increase as has been suggested (2.40-cent tariff on Cuban raws) that our increase in production, our expansion in continental United States, would barely keep pace with the increase in consumption; and unless the Philippine question of limitation is handled along with this and made a part of it I doubt if we can increase at all.

There can be no question that Mr. Lippitt is right, that a 2.40-cent rate will be useless to domestic beet growers because of free imports. A 10-cent rate would be equally valueless and only hasten the demise of our domestic beet industry.

MEXICAN LABOR

An article by S. J. Holmes, of California, appears in the North American Review for May, entitled "Perils of the Mexican Invasion," which is too long to discuss carefully; but I call attention to one or two paragraphs that bear out the reports of the Department of Labor and also of the Colorado Agricultural College and letters that I have printed herewith:

According to the reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, the influx from Mexico previous to 1900 was insignificant in amount, never rising to 1,000 per annum and seldom exceeding 500. In 1908 the recorded number suddenly shot up from 915 to 5,682. In the following year it became 15,591, and then increased by leaps and bounds, reaching its climax in 1924 with a figure of 87,648. The numbers for 1925, 1926, and 1927 were 32,278, 42,638, and 66,766, respectively. * * * (p. 615).

Cases of acute distress due to the wholesale discharge of American workers and the employment of Mexicans at a lower wage are by no means rare. The commander of an American Legion post in a prominent town in Texas stated that he had "recently attempted to place some ex-service men in employment on the farms * * *" (p. 618).

The president of the Humanitarian Heart Mission writes on conditions in Denver, as follows: "The sugar-beet company employs the very poorest and most ignorant Mexicans with large families; brings them to Denver, working them in the beet fields until snow flies. These unfortunates then congregate in Denver with \$15 or \$20 to keep a large family and no possible means of support by labor through the winter season." A Mexican slum district is coming to be a common feature of our southwestern cities. In the so-called bull pens of San Antonio, according to G. P. Nelson, "you will find barefooted and ragged children, dirty men and women, living in the filth, mud, and dirt in the most deplorable and dilapidated shacks. * * * (p. 619).

A report of the California Commission on Immigration and Housing made to the governor in 1926 states, "The Mexicans as a general rule become a public charge under slight provocation and have become a great burden to our communities. In Los Angeles the outdoor relief division states that 27.44 per cent of its cases are Mexicans. The bureau of Catholic charities reports that 53 per cent of its cases are Mexicans, who consume at least 50 per cent of the budget" * * * (p. 620).

Every reputable publication that has reached my hands is to the same effect. Again I repeat that no labor leader in this country familiar with conditions described in the beet fields of Colorado will be found to support this feature of the bill, that with Mexican and child labor produces one-half of all the beet-sugar output of the United States.

Any additional tariff will not help the beet grower but will be used largely to swell the profits of the Great Western Sugar Co.

This situation is squarely presented to Congress and there can be no answer offered that will justify the tariff rate of 3 cents recommended by Chairman TIMBERLAKE.

Now, I offer official records of the State of Colorado and Federal Government on labor conditions this bill protects.

SUGAR-BEET LABOR CONDITIONS

Representative TIMBERLAKE, from the second district of Colorado, is a colleague and personal friend of mine. He represents his constituents well. He is chairman of the sugar subcommittee that brought in this report that without any logical basis for such course increases the sugar duty from \$2.20 to \$3 per hundredweight or, as stated, a 36 per cent boost in sugar rates with a resulting 60 per cent tariff on 5-cent sugar. That report was accepted by a divided committee vote. American consumers will pay this extortion if it becomes law.

When, through the sugar chairmanship he now holds, Mr. TIMBERLAKE's constituents seek by law to extort unconscionable profits from the people of my State and sugar consumers of every other State, under conditions that challenge the condemnation of the country, I can not remain silent.

Chairman TIMBERLAKE of the sugar subcommittee frankly states he has 16 large beet-sugar mills in his second Colorado district. They belong to the Great Western Sugar Co. That company manufactures 500,000 tons annually or one-half of all the beet sugar produced in the United States. It is a corporation of large wealth that has collected enormous profits during and since the war down to 1929. In February, 1929, the Great Western Sugar Co. reported profits on its common stock, according to my information, of 45 per cent. Nearly one-half its par stock is measured by its 1928 profits.

UNCONSCIONABLE SUGAR PROFITS UNDER PRESENT TARIFF RATES

I am prepared to show that in securing its unconscionable profits from American consumers, as noted, the Great Western Sugar Co. that produces one-half of all our beet sugar does so by employing an army of children, many of them below 10 years of age and some of them as young as 6 years, who work in the fields from 10 to 14 hours a day and sleep with their families in single rooms to the number of 8, 10, and even 12 persons in a room, in tumble-down shacks or hovels frequently worse than leaky, rough-boarded woodsheds, without the commonest conveniences and no comforts.

Living and labor conditions, worse than anywhere else in the world outside of beet fields, I desire to disclose is the basis of vast profits received by this great sugar company.

Keep in mind that no beet-sugar grower is sharing in any of the mill stockholder's prosperity, nor will they ever do so until this sugar business is conducted like other lines where the interest of the employer and employee are mutual. To-day all the cream goes to the mills and skim milk, with little of it, to the grower.

FRIGHTFUL LABOR CONDITIONS IN THE BEET FIELDS

It needs a blast of righteous indignation from America's labor organizations to help wipe out this public scandal in labor conditions and to give direct support to millions of sugar consumers who are about to be robbed by this great sugar company that now demands higher prices and greater profits.

On April 20 I made specific charges in my speech of the employment of from 75 per cent to 90 per cent of Mexican labor in the sugar-beet fields. I also gave some data regarding the employment of Indian children in the beet fields of Colorado.

Replying to this speech, which was apparently fortified by astounding facts from governmental sources, a telegram was read from the Governor of Michigan denying that conditions in Michigan had been properly represented. In order to ascertain the truth, and also that Congress should know the facts and real conditions of labor in the sugar-beet fields of the country, I introduced the following resolution:

House Joint Resolution 62

Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate domestic sugar industries

Whereas an extensive survey of the domestic beet-sugar industry by the Institute of Economics and a like survey by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor alleges that of 500 families then studied one-fourth of the workers in the sugar-beet fields of Michigan were less than 10 years of age and only one-fifth of the workers had reached the age of 14 years; that 90 per cent of the mothers having children under 6 years of age worked in the fields, and half the children under that age were usually taken by their parents to the fields; and

Whereas in 1927 the Bureau of Labor is reported to have found that 75 to 90 per cent of labor in the sugar-beet fields was Mexican, and 3,048 of the 6,720 workers in the Michigan sugar-beet fields were shipped up from Texas by one company for temporary work; and

Whereas these statements from apparently reliable sources are denied by eminent State officials; and

Whereas such charges, if untrue, should be retracted by responsible officials; but, if true, are a disgrace to American standards of labor and living conditions and to every impulse of humanitarianism; and

Whereas the Great Western Sugar Co. of Colorado, which makes 50 per cent of all beet sugar in this country, in its financial statement printed in the Wall Street Journal for April 22, 1929, discloses 171 per cent increased earnings over the previous year; and

Whereas, due to rapidly growing free imports from our island possessions and destructive free competition with tropical climate, sugarcane reproduction crops, and cheap foreign labor, it is alleged the American sugar industry will soon be at an end; and

Whereas it is further alleged that no tariff, however high, can meet the situation, but because of rapidly increasing free imports the only alternative for such industry must be a direct bounty system like that built up in European countries, to be maintained by a small sugar duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee of 10 Members of Congress is hereby authorized, 5 to be appointed by the Vice President of the Senate and 5 by the Speaker of the House. Such committee is hereby authorized and directed to make a general survey of the financial and industrial

situation of domestic sugar, with special instruction to investigate into labor conditions and contracts made with beet-sugar growers; to report the effect of rapidly increasing free imports of cane sugar upon the future of the domestic sugar industry and what method can be used for the protection of such industry.

Said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ such clerical assistance as is necessary, to sit during any recess of Congress and at such places as may be deemed advisable. Any subcommittee duly authorized thereto shall have the powers conferred upon the committee by this joint resolution.

In order that the original facts then set forth may be supported by further data that challenges the serious attention of every Member of Congress, I quote herewith further facts regarding child labor in the beet fields that is based upon the highest Federal and State governmental authority, and I ask that an investigation be had covering the original facts set forth in the resolution, and in addition thereto further data that is offered herewith.

CHILD LABOR "PROTECTION" TARIFF

The United States Department of Labor has published an authoritative pamphlet, No. 115, entitled "Child Labor and the Work of Mothers in the Beet Fields of Colorado and Michigan." I have briefly recited in my speech of April 20 some conditions found in the beet fields of Michigan. The investigation by Government agents in Colorado as well as Michigan is briefly recited in the following pages:

The beet-sugar industry has been developed on a larger scale in Colorado than in any other State in the Union, and for a number of years Colorado has led all States in the area harvested and the tons of sugar produced, though both Michigan and Utah have as many sugar factories in operation. * * *

The present study of child labor and the work of mothers in the Colorado beet fields was made in the beet-raising area north of Denver, in Weld and Larimer Counties. In no other two counties in Colorado are beets so extensively grown. * * * (p. 11).

All the sugar factories in these two counties, five in number, were owned by one sugar company—the Great Western Sugar Co.—that produces 50 per cent of all our domestic beet sugar, and these counties are in the second Colorado congressional district, of which Representative TIMBERLAKE, of the sugar subcommittee, is chairman. It should be kept in mind that in his district are located 16 mills of the greatest sugar company in the country, that made profits around 45 per cent on its common stock last year, all paid by American consumers. The proposed duty of 3 cents per pound favored by his committee ought to give profits to his mill constituents of 50 per cent and more annually based on existing profits.

EXTRACTS THAT TELL THE STORY

Quoting from the report:

They reported to the Children's Bureau that 4,234, or 44 per cent, of the handworkers who they stated were required were brought in from outside districts, and that the remaining laborers were resident.

The Colorado investigation covered—

Five hundred and forty-two families in the two counties of which over three-fourths were contract laborers. Comparatively few were families owning or renting farms and cultivating their own beets, and only 13 per cent were tenant farmers. * * * (p. 13).

Less than 15 per cent of the fathers and mothers in the families visited had been born in America, and over two-fifths of these were of Mexican stock. * * * Russian-Germans formed the largest group of foreign-born parents. * * * (p. 14).

In the families visited, 1,073 children between 6 and 16 years had worked in the beet fields during the season of 1920. All except 37 of them had worked for their own parents and without remuneration. The child labor law of Colorado, like that of most States, exempts agricultural work from its minimum-age provision, and children may be put to work in the fields at any age. Four children even younger than 6 years were reported by their parents as having worked a part of each day for from one to eight weeks. Among the working children between 6 and 16 years of age covered by the study, well over one-fourth were less than 10 years of age and more than one-half were from 10 to 13, inclusive. Only 191 working children had reached their fourteenth birthday. * * * (p. 18).

More than three-fifths of the 8-year-old children in the families in which at least one older child had already gone to work were beet-field workers. From the age of 10 on practically all worked in the cultivation of beets. Even among the 6 and 7 year old children one child in four was reported as working. * * * (p. 19).

This is not in Russia or the Fiji Islands but in the State of Colorado, the home of the great, prosperous Great Western Sugar Co., in a State and district so ably represented by Representative TIMBERLAKE, chairman of the sugar subcommittee.

Of the 1,073 working children, 571 had already spent more than 6 weeks in the beet fields during the 1920 season, and 61 of them had worked from 12 to 17 weeks. Five children under 8 years of age, 18 between 8 and 9, and 16 between 9 and 10 had worked 10 weeks or more. One-fifth of the laborers' children had worked at least 10 weeks—practically twice as many proportionately as the children of tenant farmers. * * * (p. 20).

Page after page is given to specific cases of child labor in beet fields in this congressional district, and only two or three illustrations will be furnished from that pamphlet.

Four Russian-German children, ranging in age from 9 to 13 years, came to the beet fields with their family the 1st of June. They worked at thinning and blocking for more than three weeks, 14½ hours a day, beginning at 4.30 a. m. They took five minutes in the morning and again in the afternoon for a lunch. They took 20 minutes for dinner. About July 1 they went home, remaining until the middle of the month, when the hoeing began. They spent five weeks, 14½ hours a day, hoeing, and again went home, returning September 21 for the harvest, which lasted four weeks. * * *

Three little boys of 8, 10, and 12 years, with their 5-year-old sister and their mother and father, worked on contract for more than 14 weeks, 11 and 12 hours daily, caring for 53 acres of beets. * * * (p. 23).

A little Mexican girl, aged 8 years, worked at thinning 10 hours a day for four weeks in June. She did no hoeing. * * *

The paragraph further relates to the overworking of this child three and one-half weeks at 10 hours a day.

In one native American family four boys, aged 7, 10, 12, and 15 years, spent three weeks at the spring process, working an 11-hour day. They were in the field from 7 in the morning until 7 at night; took one hour off for dinner. * * *

These were not stockholders in the company that made 45 per cent profits in sugar in 1928, but the last paragraph is from a torn page of man's inhumanity to children of his fellow man. Helpless children exploited by the Great Western Sugar Co., of Colorado, that makes unconscionable profits through existing sugar rates—and yet demands more.

Again I quote from the official Government report:

A Russian-German family came out from town March 22. In this family were 3 children working, 12-year-old Frieda, 9-year-old Willie, and Jim, age 7, who worked irregularly. They spent 3 weeks at the spring work, putting in a 12½-hour day; 2 weeks at hoeing for 11 hours a day, and up to the time of the agent's visit had spent about 3 weeks at the harvest, which was not yet finished. Altogether they worked about 9 weeks, probably very hard, since the 3 children, 1 working irregularly, and 3 adults had cared for 50 acres.

Somewhat similar working conditions were found in a family in which 2 little girls, age 12 and 13 years, with 3 adults, took care of 50 acres of beets. The children had worked altogether 11 weeks, 10 and 12½ hours a day. * * * (p. 24).

Some of these children and their parents made no complaint of their work but seemed glad to get employment, which sounds like familiar sweat-shop sentiments, but a great many families, on the other hand, spoke of the hardships of the work in the beet crop, especially for women and children.

DIVIDENDS IN THE BEET FIELDS

"We all get backaches," was a common complaint. "Hardest work there is," said others. One mother "couldn't sleep nights" because her "hands and arms hurt so." Although the children, being small, do not have to bend over the plants as constantly as adults, therefore may not suffer the same sort of hardship, yet the work is no doubt a strain. A little girl, 6 years old, told the children's bureau agent that her back was getting crooked from her work "in beets." One mother declared that the "children all get tired because the work is always in a hurry." A contract laborer with a large acreage said that his children "scream and cry" from fatigue; and another said, "The children get so tired they don't want to eat and go right to bed. Beets are harder work than working in a steel mill. The children don't get fresh air, as they have to lie in the dust and crawl on their knees all day. * * *" (pp. 25-26).

Six o'clock was reported as the usual hour for beginning work, but some families started as early as 4.30 or 5 o'clock. "The old man chases us down to the field early in the morning (4 o'clock)," said one boy, adding, "But we get even with him; whenever he leaves the field we stall." After a hasty breakfast, eaten in some cases in the field, work was practically continuous until midday, when the majority of the families went home to dinner.

Can any picture of American working conditions be more degrading than this grinding of helpless children by the Great Western Sugar Co., a company that makes half of the American beet sugar at existing tariff duties and reported 45 per cent profits for last year?

The Government report continues:

There was no general lay off, as in some kinds of farm work, during the heat of the day. Only an hour was usually allowed for dinner. A few families reported their "dinner hour" as lasting only 10 minutes. Work continued until 6 or 7 o'clock. About half the laborers' families said that they took a rest of 15 minutes or half an hour in the morning or afternoon, or both, often eating a slice of bread at that time, but some regarded such a practice as all foolishness! * * * (p. 27).

On page 31 I quote:

"Fall is the meanest time," declared one of the fathers. "Women are wet up to their waists and have ice in their laps and on their underwear. Women and children have rheumatism. Jacob (13 years old) is big and strong, but already feels rheumatism, so he has to kneel while topping. Can't stand all day." Often the clothing freezes stiff in the frosty air, and only by midday does the warm sun dry off the cotton skirts and overalls. In wet years the workers say they get muddy to the skin. During the last weeks of the harvest light falls of snow frequently add to the discomfort. The children's hands are chapped and cracked from the cold, and their fingers are often sore and bleeding.

The company officials forgot to give that picture to the Ways and Means Committee.

Page after page of this enlightening report relates to work in the beet fields and the housing and sanitation, where lack of both and living quarters are bad beyond description. On page 67 I quote:

HERE'S HOW THE WORKERS LIVE

Many of the beet-field laborers' families live under such conditions of overcrowding that all comfort and convenience had to be sacrificed, and no privacy was possible. * * * There were 320 of these families, amounting to 77 per cent of the total number. Only 21 per cent reported less than 2 persons per room. Almost half were living with 3 or more persons to a room. One hundred and ninety-one families, amounting to 77 per cent of the total number. One hundred and them were 94 households of more than 6 members each and 14 of 10 or more each; the latter included 1 household in which there were 2 families and another consisting of 3 families. This means that from 3 to 7 persons had to sleep in each of the two rooms, one of which had to be used as a kitchen and living room. Fifty families, consisting of from 3 to 11 persons per family, lived in one room. One of these households included a father, his son and daughter, each over 16 years of age, a younger child, and a girl over 16 who helped the family with the beet-field work. * * * (p. 67).

We send missionaries to China; why not Colorado? We expect children to grow up into decent men and women, with 11 people living in one room. That is necessary, however, if 45 per cent annual profits are to be squeezed out of child labor by the Great Western Sugar Co.

On page 69, regarding the health of school children working in the beet fields, it says:

It was not difficult in Weld and Larimer Counties to find during school hours in October, November, and December, 1920, 1,022 children belonging to families employed in the beet fields, although the beet harvest season was at its height and many schools in these two counties had been closed to allow the children to work in the fields. These children may be considered a fairly typical group as far as working conditions are concerned. * * *

And the same company that made 45 per cent profits last year continues to exploit these children.

In the same document of 122 pages is contained a long discussion of child-labor conditions in Michigan beet fields. I have referred to this in my previous discussion in the House and can only add that the facts heretofore recited are sustained by specific cases on every page. For illustration, on page 85—

In the 511 families visited were 763 children between 6 and 16 years of age who had worked in the beet fields in 1920. Only 1 in 5 had reached the age of 14 or 15, while 1 in 4 was less than 10 years of age. Over one-half were from 10 to 13 years of age. In some families no child was considered too young to count as a beet-field worker. One Hungarian father, a miner from West Virginia, who said he had come to the beet-growing country because his children were too young to work in the mines, but could help "in beets," had all four of his children at work in the fields, the oldest 12, the youngest only 5 years of age. Four children under the age of 6 were reported by their parents as working. In most families, however, the tendency was to spare the very youngest children. * * * Nevertheless in families in which it appeared to be customary for children to work, judging by the fact that at least one older child was a beet-field worker, almost one-fifth of the 6-year-old children and two-fifths of those who were 7 years of age were at work. At 8 three-fifths of the children in these families, and at 11 practically all, had begun working in the beet fields.

Page after page of statistics are given to child-labor disclosures, which statements have been specifically denied before the committee in a telegram from the Governor of Michigan.

AFTER THE SUGAR HARVEST

Many items of human interest affect this Mexican child-labor situation and I could quote extensively on the same, but a paragraph from the speech of Hon. JOHN C. BOX, of Texas, May 23, 1928, has been called to my attention and ought not to be overlooked. He quotes witnesses before his committee as saying:

Mexican labor receives lowest wages paid this section. Living conditions this class intolerable.

From a letter written March 5, 1928, to me from San Antonio, Tex., by R. T. Glenn:

"A Mexican laborer can live and does live on about 15 cents per day table expenses. This is common knowledge here. As for housing, from one to three families in one block * * *."

H. H. Maris, who signs as president of the Humanitarian Heart Mission, writes me from Denver, Colo., March 1, 1928, a letter from which I quote:

"The sugar-beet company imports the very poorest and ignorant Mexicans with large families; brings them to Denver, working them in the beet fields until snow flies. They then congregate in Denver with \$15 to \$20 to keep a large family, and no possible means of support by labor in sight, through the winter season. The police and city kangaroo courts vag most of the men, keeping them in jail for the winter, leaving their poor mothers and their children to starve through these desolate months. Children absolutely barefooted in the snow. I have seen 29 men and women in one room with an old, dirty bed mattress laying on the floor of the room, all of the 29 adults using the mattress for a pillow, the small children and babies in the center of the mattress and the adults laying on the floor with only newspapers under them * * *."

Again remember this is not in the wilds of Africa but in Colorado, after the beet-field worker has received his part of the profits from his work.

I quote from paragraphs on page 108, that are typical of many other statements in this illuminating publication:

Many women declared "beet work is no work for women," and told of their difficulties in trying to help in the fields and perform the most necessary household tasks, even when adequate care for the children was not considered. The following are typical comments on this situation made by mothers, all of whom had young children.

"I have to work in the field from 4 o'clock in the morning until 7 o'clock at night and then come home and cook and bake until 12 and 1 o'clock."

"At first I tried to cook—worked in the field from half past 5 in the morning until 7 at night, and then came home, and was often making bread and cake at 1 and 2 in the morning. But it was too much, and toward the end of our hoeing there were days when we practically lived on milk." * * *

"The work is too hard for any woman. By the time you have worked 12 or 13 hours a day bending over you don't feel much like doing your cooking and housework." * * *

WHO DENIES THESE GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS?

Some of the descriptions regarding children of the mothers in these pages are so heart-rending that they condemn the entire sugar-beet business as conducted in this country. It has been said by the Governor of Michigan that these painstaking surveys of conditions in Michigan and, I also assume, in Colorado are not to be absolutely accepted. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who reads the facts related and many pages of specific cases referred to that every illustration was correctly noted and in many cases understates rather than overstates the situation.

No wonder governors resent such criticism of their Commonwealths. Will the Governor of Michigan and the Governor of Colorado invite Congress to send a committee to those States to investigate the charges made in my speech of April 20 and others recited herein? I will warrant that anything other than a whitewashing committee will find the child-labor situation practically as stated by responsible Government inspectors, who have no reason to exaggerate conditions. They are bad enough without exaggeration.

HERE IS AN INDEPENDENT COLORADO REPORT

I have before me the Fifth Annual Report of the Mexican Welfare Committee of the Colorado State Council of the Knights of Columbus. This report is as severe in its denunciation of existing labor conditions in Colorado as anything I have seen, but I can only give space to one or two quotations which are typical of many others in the same publication:

TWENTY THOUSAND MEXICAN WORKERS

During 1926, according to the best information obtainable, there were more than 15,000 Spanish-speaking beet workers, "hands," in the

northern Colorado sugar-beet districts, over 3,000 in the Arkansas Valley, about 1,000 on the western slope, and about 4,000 in the mines, on the railroads, and in other common labor. * * *

During part of the year 4,000 to 7,000 Spanish-speaking people live in Denver. There they are crowded into slum districts and live under conditions and subject to environment and influence that can not help but be detrimental to health, morals, and religious faith. * * *

MIGRATION AND HOUSING

Because of bad housing, polluted water, lack of screens, and sanitation, a great deal of preventable sickness always exists and the death rate, particularly among the women and children, is high. In one district in Weld County a recent survey made by the National Child Welfare Committee states that "out of 104 Mexican families 57 lost 152 children by death. This averaged 2.7 children per family for the ones who are lost and 1.5 for the group." Such conditions are a menace not only to the Mexicans but because of possible epidemics to entire communities.

Publication after publication carries out this same tale of labor conditions in the beet-sugar fields. Remember, this is from Colorado, where the sun shines alike on the just and unjust, on the helpless children in beet fields and on those who exploit them.

Let me further say that nobody in Colorado has yet furnished a scintilla of evidence that the beet growers of the State share in the prosperity of the mill owners. The beet growers continue to work in jeans and rags, but their mill employers will parade in silks until a better and fairer adjustment of profits occurs.

FROM AN OFFICIAL COLORADO STATE PUBLICATION

Other and more recent statistics have been made of the children working in the beet-sugar farms in northern Colorado, and I have before me a publication entitled "Series 27," issued November, 1926, by the Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo. It comprises 160 pages on child labor. It would be impossible for me to more than touch upon conditions as related by this book, but again I invite your attention to pages that recite unbelievable conditions now existing in sugar-beet fields carried on by the Great Western Sugar Co. in Colorado. Remember again this is Colorado testimony. Quoting from page 35 of this publication it states:

Nine children were found working at 6 years of age, 2 of these being children of owner, 3 of tenant, and 4 of contract families. There were 28 children working at 7 years of age, 22 of whom were from the contract family. There were 91 8-year-old workers, 73 of whom were contract children, 11 tenant, and 7 owners. The largest number of workers of any age was at 14, where we found 164. This is not at all significant, as 161 children were working at 12, 155 at 13 years (p. 35).

More than 1,000 working children of all ages and tenures worked in the handwork of crops an average of 8.3 hours a day for an average of 44 days. This included all children from 6 to 15 years of age, and it included many children who worked for a very short time and for a very few hours per day * * * (p. 37).

Among the 6-year-olds, one worked 14 hours a day, two 12 hours a day, and one 10 hours a day. (In a State that boasts of its high standards and in a country where American labor and union rules have recognition.) Among the 7-year-olds, one worked 13 hours a day, three worked 12 hours a day, one 11 hours, and five 10 hours a day. Of the 9-year-olds, one worked 14 hours a day, two 13 hours, ten 12 hours, fifteen worked 11 hours, and forty-three worked 10 hours a day. Among the 12-year-olds, seven worked 14 hours, four 13 hours, fifteen 12 hours, twenty-two 11 hours, and sixty 10 hours (p. 38).

This is taken from an official Colorado agricultural publication that describes working conditions in the Great Western Sugar Co. beet fields. I submit they are nowhere worse in the world than in the State of Colorado.

Again I quote:

Two Mexican children worked 16 hours a day, 1 German and 13 Spanish working 14 hours a day; 13 Germans and 10 Mexicans working 13 hours a day, and so on * * *.

Union labor is contending for seven and eight hour days and five days a week. Is it possible that union labor and the American Federation of Labor alone need protection, or will its officials close its eyes to the scandalous condition found among these children who work among American sugar-beet fields? Page after page is given over to such children and also to their families. It is largely a repetition of conditions related in the Department of Labor publication, but I quote a paragraph from page 90, which sounds familiar to those who are seeking the facts:

The contract houses are usually unattractive, frequently in bad repair; often without screens, often in a dirty condition to begin with. One-fourth of them are old. Often surroundings are dirty, and fre-

quently the houses are too close to barns or corrals. The toilet (always outdoor) is frequently little short of indecent in condition and repair. Granted that the conditions are as good or better than in the previous homes of the people under consideration, it becomes a question of American ideals and standards.

So says this Colorado agricultural publication.

This is not only for the inspection of labor officials but calls for words of explanation from the Great Western Sugar Co., to which I will briefly refer later. On page 91 it states:

I find that the average number of persons per bedroom among the owner families is 1.91; among tenant families, 2.4; owner additional, 2.4; wage, 2.5; and contract, 4 * * *.

MANY TALES OF MISERY FOR SUGAR PROFITEERS

Of the 296 contract families in the study 19 lived in 1-room shacks. Of these 19 families in 1-room shacks there are in two of them 3 persons; in two others, 4 persons; in three others, 8 persons; in one 1-room shack, 6 persons; in four 1-room shacks, 7 persons; in three 1-room shacks, 8 persons; and one other, 12 persons. Nine of these 1-room shacks house 6 or more persons, one houses 12 persons, and a lean-to tent is provided for the hired man. Thirteen of these families are of Spanish descent and 6 are Russian-Germans * * *. There are no bath facilities in any of these houses * * *.

Continuing on page 99:

One father expressed the housing condition this way, "The general conditions of the house ain't much." Said a Mexican mother with 12 in the family, all in one room, "How can you expect folks to live decently when given a place like that (pointing to the shack) to live in?" And the surveyor added, "When it rains, with the roof full of holes, they are wet; in May it was impossible to keep warm, and now it is insufferably hot."

The houses of the contract families may be expected to be found in locations near barns or irrigation ditches, where flies and mosquitoes are most numerous. Yet these are the very buildings with the largest number of unscreened doors and windows. * * *

It will be readily understood that people living under such conditions in the enlightened State of Colorado and children of 6 years working 10 hours a day and more in the beet fields without any bathing facilities in the average house are not given much recreation. After having visited cane-sugar fields in the Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Cuba, I say without hesitation that nothing in all these islands can compare in degraded surroundings and insanitary conditions with those described in Colorado. Nowhere in all the islands have I observed child labor as depicted in these various publications. In fact, I challenge any Member of the House to present evidence of child labor in any of the islands or elsewhere that will compare with the conditions described by these official publications to exist in Colorado.

Never in all history, I submit, has such a monstrous proposal been offered to Congress as that disclosed by this great sugar company that made 45 per cent profits on its common stock last year out of \$7 per ton beet-sugar contracts with labor produced by women, and children in many cases under 7 and 8 years of age.

Again I submit on the official record how can anyone justify a 36 per cent increase or any increased tariff to a company that produces one-half of all the domestic beet sugar manufactured in the country, that makes regularly over 40 per cent annually on its original invested capital, and enjoys these profits by the worst record of labor conditions ever placed in official records of the Government and State under which it prospers, while asking increased protection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of my remarks I quoted from some public documents, but I did not quote all of them. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert those documents in an extension of my remarks.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10813) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10813. Pending that, he asks unanimous consent that the

time for general debate be equally divided and controlled by himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to run through Wednesday, or to give way for Calendar Wednesday business?

Mr. SIMMONS. I rather think that we will finish general debate to-morrow, and then take up the bill for reading under the 5-minute rule on Thursday.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman expects to conclude general debate to-morrow?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. LA GUARDIA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to-day to discuss H. R. 9687, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SWICK, as a substitute for his original bill, H. R. 9146. H. R. 9687 proposes to grant pensions to disabled soldiers of the World War who are unable to prove service connection; also to their widows and minor children.

I offer no apology in presenting this subject to the House within 12 years of the close of the World War. It has been my privilege to serve on the Pensions Committee since coming to the House, and also to present hundreds of cases before the Veterans' Bureau. No one can come in personal contact with these non-service-connected cases, hear their stories, and not seek to find some way to render aid.

I am firmly convinced our present system penalizes a large number of service men who rendered valiant service on the other side of the Atlantic. We are all familiar with that high type of young manhood which spurns the thought of sickness and uses every effort that no hospital record be charged against him. Sickness and hospitals to him are symbols of weakness. We are not unfamiliar with the other type of young man, who, when he arrived again in America, could not restrain his desire to hasten home and in his haste to again meet those he loved, waived all ceremony on being mustered out of service. To-day, 12 years later, these same men, many of them badly disabled, are being uncared for by the Government they served, for the reason they neglected to have a hospital record. These are the men I would now aid.

The great necessity for this legislation is evidenced by the many bills introduced and considered for many weeks by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and finally the report to the House on H. R. 10381. The means proposed in most of these bills is to extend the presumption clause of service-connected disabilities for a period of years. As desirable as this form of legislation may be there is no one so optimistic as to believe that any future Congress would dare fail to reenact this legislation and at that time further extend the presumption of service origin.

If the above were not enough reason for discussing this subject I would take the statement of General Hines in his testimony before the World War Veterans' Committee on page 71, when they were considering H. R. 7825, when he said:

I think that every member of this committee, and probably all of us present, feel perfectly certain that before we get through with granting benefits to the World War men, we will approach the pension in some form, and whether we call it compensation or call it pension, that is bound to come; because it has been the history of our Republic that we will take care of those men at a certain period in their lives.

Now, of course, by doing what we have been doing from time to time, liberalizing the act, we have probably avoided that; but it does seem to me that we are rapidly reaching the point where some of the changes in the law are so near to pension that we might as well recognize it and study the thing right now.

I fully realize what a pension would mean as to the World War, even the smallest that we could do; but I can not believe that we should do by presumption what we can not do directly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I make bold to suggest in behalf of the thousands of disabled non-service-connected ex-service men, in

behalf of the widows of these men whose death occurred from causes not of service origin, and in fairness to the National Treasury that H. R. 9687 be given speedy consideration and that we now proceed to adopt a true pension system and cease dealing with the subject under an assumed name.

Section 1 of this bill would grant a pension ranging, according to the extent of disability for performing manual labor, from \$10 to \$50 per month to any person who entered service prior to November 11, 1918, and who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the period of the World War between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, and was honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty.

Section 2 contemplates an allowance of \$72 per month to anyone having title to a pension under section 1 who is in such a condition as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Section 3 provides that no person while an inmate of a national home or State soldiers' home for a period of more than four months in any one year shall be paid in excess of \$30 per month during each period of hospitalization.

Section 4 would grant a pension of \$30 per month to the widow of a soldier, sailor, or marine, irrespective of cause of death, who entered the service prior to November 10, 1918, and served 90 days or more during the World War and was honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for, or died in service, of a disability incurred in the service in line of duty, provided such marriage was entered into prior to the approval of this act. An additional \$6 is allowed each month for each child of the soldier under 16 years of age, and may be continued after 16 under certain conditions.

A careful study of the provisions of the Swick bill-made by the Bureau of Pensions, based on experience gained in the administration of the Spanish-American pension act, for the relief of veterans of Indian wars, and of the various pension laws dealing with the Civil War, give valuable information on the cost of administering this bill.

The first assumption is that over the first 5-year period 25 per cent of all potential pensioners will prove their claims for some degree of disability; also, the average rate will amount to \$15 per month. Under the Spanish-American law, enacted in 1920, the average monthly pension was \$16.17.

The above figures take into consideration the changed economic conditions of the country and the greater hazard incident to the World War, resulting in a high percentage of nervous disorders. Another feature in this study is the possible number of surviving claimants. Authorities differ as to the actual number of men who served in the World War. The figures range from 4,800,000 to 4,355,000. In this computation we use the maximum number. We have eliminated 141,000 who served less than 90 days, 400,000 who have died, and 262,000 now drawing compensation. We reach the conclusion that at the present time there are 4,000,000 potential claimants, or, at the end of the 5-year period, 1,000,000 will be on the pension roll.

The result of this computation over a 5-year period, giving the per cent of possible pensioners, the actual number, the annual rate of pension, and the cumulative numbers, is as follows:

Year	Per cent	Number for year	Annual rate	Cumulative number	Cumulative cost
First.....	10	100,000	\$180	100,000	\$18,000,000
Second.....	25	250,000	180	350,000	63,000,000
Third.....	25	250,000	180	600,000	108,000,000
Fourth.....	20	200,000	180	800,000	144,000,000
Fifth.....	20	200,000	180	1,000,000	180,000,000
Total.....	100	1,000,000			513,000,000
Average annual cost.....					102,600,000

The proposed legislation also includes widows and minors and a close study gives the following results:

Year	Per cent	Number for year	Annual rate	Cumulative number	Cumulative cost
First.....	10	18,500	\$400	18,500	\$7,400,000
Second.....	25	46,250	400	64,750	25,900,000
Third.....	25	46,250	400	111,000	44,400,000
Fourth.....	20	37,000	400	148,000	59,200,000
Fifth.....	20	37,000	400	185,000	74,000,000
Total.....	100	185,000			210,900,000
Average annual cost.....					42,180,000

A recapitulation of percentage and number of claims allowable and cost during first five years is as follows:

Year	Per-centage	Soldiers		Widows and minors		Total	
		Cumula-tive number	Cumula-tive cost	Cumula-tive number	Cumula-tive cost	Cumula-tive number	Cumula-tive cost
First.....	10	100,000	\$18,000,000	18,500	\$7,400,000	118,500	\$25,400,000
Second.....	25	350,000	63,000,000	64,750	25,900,000	414,750	88,900,000
Third.....	25	600,000	108,000,000	111,000	44,400,000	711,000	152,400,000
Fourth.....	20	800,000	144,000,000	148,000	59,200,000	948,000	203,200,000
Fifth.....	20	1,000,000	180,000,000	185,000	74,000,000	1,185,000	254,000,000
Total.....	100		513,000,000		210,900,000		723,900,000

Average annual cost:	
Soldiers.....	\$102,600,000
Widows.....	42,180,000
Total.....	144,780,000

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Recently I introduced a bill for the purpose of granting relief to an indigent woman, the daughter of a veteran of the Civil War, and was informed that because claim had not been made for her before she was 16 years of age, the committee would not consider the bill. I think that is substantially the reason assigned. It occurs to me that there is a strange inconsistency in that here is a woman who goes along not asking for aid until she reaches 65 years, and who is now indigent, helpless, without a friend on earth. She can not get a pension, although as a child of 16 years she could have gotten relief. In other words, the committee favors those who can enjoy a pension for a very long time, but is indisposed to consider the claim of one who can not enjoy it for more than a very few years at best. I want to get the gentleman's thought on that question.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I think the proper way to handle that would be by a special act.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I introduced a special bill, and the committee will not consider it.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. It is believed the above figures are very liberal. We have used the maximum number who served in the war and we have not taken into consideration the fact that the World War soldier is on an average nine years younger than the Spanish-American soldier was in 1920 when his first disability pension act was enacted into law. The subject of cost of administration of this law has not been completely estimated. However, I am reliably informed that the Pension Bureau estimates the law could be administered fully by the addition of 400 clerks to their present force of 600 employees. I am also informed that they can begin administering the law immediately upon its enactment with no delay whatever, even utilizing the present application blanks and the splendid medical staff of 5,000 physicians distributed in all parts of the country. These physicians give the examination on a fee basis of \$5 per examination.

Many arguments may be presented for this proposed legislation. It is believed the disabled veteran will welcome a settled pension status rather than the uncertainties of the present system whereby to-day he is drawing compensation but to-morrow he is notified he is off the list. It is believed it will lighten the growing hospital load, as under the present laws the only means a disabled non-service-connected man has to secure relief is by asking for hospitalization. It will grant relief to twice as many individuals the first year as any other form of proposed legislation and over a 5-year period, more than eight times the number. The cost of administration is much less, leaving the bulk of the money appropriated to go direct to the veteran himself.

Over a period of years the cost of administering the pension law has been one-half of 1 per cent; or, placing it in other figures, the cost of the Pension Bureau in disbursing \$100,000,000 is \$500,000, while to disburse the same amount under the Veterans' Bureau the cost is \$6,000,000.

So, gentlemen of the committee, in presenting this subject to you for your consideration I do so not disparaging any other method of dealing with this particular subject, but I am discussing it as a possible solution of the problem. I deal with it with the thought in mind of the number of men who will be aided, of the thousands who ought to be relieved, and also taking into consideration the ease with which it can be administered, and having in mind the mental condition of the men themselves who desire a settled status in their relationship to the Government. It appears to me that this proposed piece of legislation deserves our earnest consideration. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS. This would in no way interfere with the men's trying for direct service connection and presumption under the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. It would in no way change the status of those who have service connection, and who would continue on at the same rate that they are now receiving under the Veterans' Bureau, unless they should be perhaps reexamined and rerated.

Mrs. ROGERS. A claimant could still try for the direct service connection and presumption under the World War veterans' act even if this law went into effect.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. He would have the option of applying either with the Veterans' Bureau or applying under the Pension Bureau, as provided in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS. Will the gentleman again state the estimated cost of the bill?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. The estimated cost at the close of the first year, dealing with 100,000 pensioners and 18,500 widows and minors, is \$25,400,000.

Mrs. ROGERS. And this would take care of cases of disability and need?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is that in addition to the present cost of administering the Veterans' Bureau, or is that the total cost?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. That is the total cost of this particular bill and the claims that would come under these provisions.

Mr. CANFIELD. Then that will be in addition to what the Government is already paying the World War veterans?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. But the administration of it under this system would be much less in cost than under the present system.

Mr. HALL of Indiana. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. The gentleman means much less per man, not much less in total?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. I mean the total cost of administering this law would be much less than to get the same relief under the operation of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. ROMJUE. And the difference in the comparative cost to the Government between the present system and the pension system administered through the Veterans' Bureau is about \$25,000,000?

Mr. HALL of Indiana. The total cost of administering is \$25,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LA GUARDIA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10813) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, reported that that committee had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 3, at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech on Philippine independence which I recently delivered at Bucknell University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by myself at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., March 14, 1930, broadcasted over the radio through station WJBU.

The address is as follows:

I am happy to speak on the subject which you selected for me. There is no theme dearer and more sacred to the Filipino heart than the independence of his native land. It is the burning question of the day and it is proper that Americans should be duly informed of the situation because the time has come for definite and immediate action on the part of the Government of the United States with a view to a final settlement of American-Philippine relations.

To the 13,000,000 Filipinos, the question of Philippine independence is the question of questions, the problem of problems. It is not only the question toward which all other questions lead but it is the problem from which all other problems radiate. I am truly grateful to the authorities of Bucknell University for having made so satisfactory a choice of subject for me.

Let me state at the outset that Philippine independence is the objective of America's Philippine policy. It is also the summit of Filipino aspirations.

We accepted President McKinley's announcement to the world as a statement of America's altruistic policy toward my people, when he said:

"The Philippines are ours, not to exploit but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government. This is the path of duty which we must follow or be recreant to a mighty trust committed to us."

This was made more explicit when the same martyred President in 1899 sought to impress upon the Filipino people that the members of the Philippine Commission sent by the people and Government of the United States to my country were the bearers of "the richest blessings of a liberating rather than a conquering Nation." All American Presidents from McKinley to Coolidge, irrespective of party, reiterated substantially the same policy, and the Filipinos accepted your words as gospel truth when, in Executive declarations, in American party platforms, and in congressional enactments, we were assured that "it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein."

It is thus clear that there is no question as to America's real purpose with respect to the Philippine Islands. We believe that America's promise is more binding than a treaty because the pledge was voluntarily made. It was not exacted by force nor by coercion. It was made out of the generosity of the American heart and as a logical outcome of America's highest traditions. It was a pledge made solemnly and honorably by the richest and the most powerful Republic to a people relatively poor, weak, and small.

When the Philippine autonomy act was approved by Congress and by an American President in 1916 these words were embodied:

"Whereas for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose it is desirable to place in the hands of the people of the Philippines as large a control of their domestic affairs as can be given them without, in the meantime, impairing the exercise of the rights of sovereignty by the people of the United States, in order that, by the use and exercise of popular franchise and governmental powers, they may be the better prepared to fully assume the responsibilities and enjoy all the privileges of complete independence."

You will notice that it says, "for the speedy accomplishment of such purpose"; that means immediate independence; and I say now, not in the distant future, is the time for Congress definitely to act. If the citizens of this Republic believe with me that the hour for action has struck, I trust you will effectively make known your conviction.

I come to you deeply appreciative of the record of splendid achievements made during the 32 years of American occupation of the Philippines. It is a record which does credit to both Americans and Filipinos alike. Authorities of recognized ability who know the progress that has been made in the Philippines for the last three decades have pronounced it as unparalleled in the history of the world. We are not disposed to air our grievances because of our faith and confidence in the validity of America's promise. A generation and more of intimate contact has brought us to a point where we must come to a definite conclusion as to the result of America's experiment in the field of administering the affairs of a dependent people. The inevitable conclusion is that that experiment has been either a failure or a success.

Those who deny that the time has come for the redemption of America's pledge must unwittingly admit that America's administration of Philippine affairs was not a success. To them I say: If America has not succeeded, then it is time for us to be permitted to run our own affairs unhampered and untrammelled.

The preponderant majority, I think, of those who studied the Philippine question will say that America's Philippine experiment was a success. To those who thus think, I say the time has come to terminate American-Philippine relationship so that America may gloriously crown with a fitting climax that experiment and so that the Filipinos may at last be permitted to carve out their own destiny by the application of their own genius and talent.

After a frank avowal on my part as a representative of my people here in the United States that we recognize the great debt of gratitude which we owe you, I trust nothing that I shall say or leave unsaid will be construed as an attempt, direct or indirect, to minimize the credit which America richly deserves. With that assurance, which I trust you will accept in the spirit in which it is given, let us proceed with the further discussion of the subject frankly and without reserve.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Filipino people believe in all sincerity that the time for the grant of our independence is overdue. An American President in 1920 certified to our having fulfilled the only condition ex-

acted, the only requirement imposed, preparatory to the grant of independence to us. It was then recommended to Congress that it was your liberty and your privilege immediately to make us independent. Fourteen years have elapsed and that recommendation still remains unheeded. A campaign of misinformation and misrepresentation has been waged from time to time by those adverse to America's early redemption of her pledge. A small group of economic and financial interests seems to have had the ear of the American public. More recently the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, with headquarters at New York, according to the testimony of its president before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, raised funds and circularized "every daily and weekly paper of the United States" and various manufacturers seeking to enlist their aid against immediate Philippine independence.

Fortunately for the Philippine cause, however, there are various high-minded individuals and organizations in the United States who are aiding in this great battle for the supremacy of human rights. The National Federation of Labor, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, the National Dairy Union, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and various business, civic, social, educational, and religious organizations have expressed themselves categorically in favor of the immediate independence of the Philippine Islands. This is certainly in keeping with the traditions of this Republic, based upon the proposition that all men are created equal and that governments derive their just rights from the consent of the governed.

The people of the Philippines are certainly grateful for this increased interest in the proper and early solution of the Philippine problem. We believe that if American public opinion were duly and adequately informed it would express itself unequivocally in our favor. I am frank to say that among the great obstacles toward early action are the seeming apathy on the part of those who occupy seats of the mighty and the natural indifference of a self-sufficient people.

From my observation and contact with the people of this country, I am irresistibly drawn to the conclusion that if the American people could but vote upon the independence question to-morrow, there would be no doubt about the favorable result. I have not lost my faith and confidence in America's high purposes. Precisely, because of their faith, my people, in fighting for their national emancipation now, have no other thought than to use only those agencies and methods dictated by reason and prudence, and sanctioned by peaceful and constitutional means and practices. I fervently hope that America may soon heed our just petitions, not only to save us from despair and desperation but because it would be a distinct triumph of the efficacy of peace in international relations. When the Philippine republic will have been established it will be an event which will reflect honor and credit both to America and the Philippines, and an enduring monument to our happy and peaceful relationship.

No true American in his heart of hearts can really object successfully to the early grant of Philippine independence. The very instinct of the American is deeply rooted in his innate love of freedom. Hardly anyone would be disposed, I think, to meet us squarely on the clear-cut issue of freedom. The atmosphere of liberty envelops your American institutions. The spirit of 1776 is in the very air that you breathe. It saturates the spirit of your individual and social life.

Indeed, it is the very life of this Republic. All that is left for those who are not now in favor of Philippine independence is either to ask for postponement of the date when it should be granted or present more or less laborious arguments seeking to justify further delay.

You will be told, for example, as I have heard it said, that America has not yet fully completed her task in the Philippines. But this is not an argument; it is a mere excuse. The same contention could be advanced 30 years, 300 years, 3,000 years from now. Of course, the time will never come when America will absolutely and completely finish her task. Problems are eternal. New ones spring up with every new era and every epoch. If America must wait, before the grant of independence, when there will be no more work to be done, I say it will not be worth while living when that time comes. Life is important, life is enjoyable, life is worth living, only when there are obstacles to overcome, when there are problems to solve, when there are unfinished tasks to meet. If America has to wait until all work that must be done is finished, then I say in all candor and frankness that that will be our finish.

Others will tell you that we are unreasonable in our demands for independence, because the Filipinos are enjoying the rights and privileges of citizens without assuming the obligations. I ask you, is this a valid argument? I say, no; and I am going to give you two reasons which I think ought to be sufficient. In the first place, it is not true that under our present status we enjoy the rights and privileges of American citizenship. The truth is that we do not enjoy them. Furthermore, we are not eligible to American citizenship, which ought to be the highest prerogative that one can enjoy, living under the Stars and Stripes. In the second place, let me ask you, is it right and proper that any man, or a group of men, should enjoy rights and privileges without assuming the corresponding obligations? Rights and duties are correlative. Privileges and obligations ought to go hand in hand. It is not manly to enjoy rights and privileges without

assuming duties and responsibilities. The moral fiber of a nation can be strengthened only by the full enjoyment of rights and privileges, and the full assumption of the burdens and obligations of which those rights and privileges are correlative.

Still others will tell you that it is not right that the Filipinos should now or in the near future be given their independence because dire consequences will follow the withdrawal of American sovereignty. Opponents of early action on independence are working overtime to depict the awful consequences that would follow the redemption of America's pledge. One of the consequences which people adverse to the grant of Philippine independence have prophesied is that we shall suffer "a complete economic collapse." Of course, you know and I know that this is not true. Under the most adverse conditions imaginable, we will never have the same difficulties which we had to undergo during the worst epoch of Philippine history when our country was under the Spanish rule. We know ourselves. We know what we are capable of accomplishing. The Filipinos are a virile people. Necessity as you know is the mother of invention. Patriotism will rouse us from that lethargic existence which prolonged dependence is apt to induce to an active life which independence should produce. Our devotion to the perpetuity of the Philippine republic will stimulate us to suffer and to labor, suffer for our ideals and labor for our own salvation. No; we shall not witness a "complete economic collapse". Have no fear on that score for we shall be starting our independent government under conditions far better than those confronting the heroic and admirable people of America in 1776.

Another contention is that when freed there will be trouble and massacre and war among the inhabitants of the Philippines. The answer is that we are a peaceful people, law-abiding. There are no differences, racial or otherwise, among the Filipinos which support this groundless claim. We have permanently solved the Philippine agrarian problem. The Filipino people are a race of home-owning and land-owning people devoted to the arts of peace, not those of war. We are homogeneous. There exists a national solidarity as a result of our common past, our identity of interests, and our devotion to a common goal.

Although much is said and published with respect to the alleged enmity between the Christian Filipinos and the Mohammedan Filipinos, as a Filipino I wish to assure you that this alleged enmity exists more in the minds of those who are not favorably disposed toward the granting of independence. There is as much religious harmony in the Philippines as there is in the United States. According to the last official census, 91 per cent of the Philippine population are Christians, 9 per cent non-Christians, 5 per cent of whom are pagans and only 4 per cent are Mohammedans. There is no more friction or enmity between the Christian and non-Christian Filipinos than there is between the wet and the dry of this country.

I regret that time does not permit the analysis of other arguments that have been advanced against the grant of immediate independence. I wish only to reiterate that for economic, for social, for political, for cultural, and for moral reasons, the time has come for a definite settlement of American-Philippine relations.

Let me now present in summarized form the benefits which will accrue to the Filipino people by the early grant of independence, points which I took occasion to present to the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, before which I recently appeared.

BENEFITS ACCRUING THROUGH GRANT OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

1. The immediate grant of Philippine independence would free the people of the islands from the benumbing effect of the present state of uncertainty.
2. Philippine independence will bring about greater economic stability eventually. Now capital is timid because of the present indefinite political status of our country.
3. An independent status would remove the constant dread in business circles from changes in tariff relations over which the Philippine people have no control.
4. The grant of Philippine freedom will remove the constant danger of having taxes unexpectedly imposed directly or indirectly upon Philippine products. Now it is possible for Philippine investors to suffer reverses overnight by a slight change in the tariff. Philippine industries, too, may be indirectly taxed as illustrated by the measure amending the oleomargarine act.
5. Independence will also do away with the fear of having the American coastwise shipping laws extended to the Philippines which may under the existing situation be accomplished by presidential proclamation. The Filipinos, not being eligible to American citizenship, would suffer greatly in their shipping and commerce should the coastwise shipping laws of the United States be made applicable to the Philippines.
6. The establishment of an independent Philippine government will place in the hands of the Filipinos the instruments of their economic salvation. Now the Filipino people have no control over matters affecting our tariff relations, our mines, our forests, and our public domain.
7. The early grant of freedom will hasten the development of greater economic mindedness among our people. The continuation of

the present uncertainty and anomaly will tend to arrest the economic development of the Philippines.

8. The grant of independence will permit the Filipino people to adopt a constitution which will be better suited to their psychological and sociological nature.

9. The establishment of an independent government with a constitution of our own creation will make it possible for our people to develop a more unified and scientific Philippine legal system.

10. With independence the Filipinos will develop greater responsibility in governmental matters. Full responsibility can be fostered only by our having complete authority.

11. From the standpoint of culture and education, independence is essential and necessary to enable the people of my country to shape an educational philosophy which is conducive to good, patriotic, and useful Philippine citizenship. Now we can not train our youth for American citizenship, for we can not be citizens of this Republic; nor can we train them for true Philippine citizenship, for we do not have a free self-governing country.

12. With independence we can redefine the aims and purposes of Philippine education, so as to train Filipino boys and girls to become free, efficient, and happy citizens of a country truly free, prosperous, and democratic.

13. A free and independent existence will enable the Filipino people to achieve their highest development. It will furnish a new and permanent motive to our individual and social life.

14. Independence will usher us into the modern current of internationalism. Nationalism, developed in the atmosphere of freedom is an essential prerequisite to sound internationalism. We as a people will, when free, be in a better position to cultivate our own talent and genius and contribute in full measure to the common heritage of the world.

15. Philippine independence will satisfy our individual desire and our national ambition, and will be a powerful incentive to our putting forth our best so as to merit a place in the family of free nations.

16. An independent Philippines will be a modern contribution to the new world order based upon the enduring foundations of peace. With freedom the Filipino people will be in a better position to exemplify the wisdom of peace and the criminality of war—peace as an attribute both human and divine and war as a grievous wrong and an enormous crime. We shall also be better qualified to occupy our allotted place in the interknit mosaic of mankind.

These, I think, are more or less self-explanatory.

I now present very briefly a summary of the advantages to America by granting Philippine independence at the earliest possible date.

ADVANTAGES TO AMERICA BY GRANTING PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

1. America by granting Philippine independence would experience that joy and satisfaction which come from the fulfillment of a sacred promise.
2. The early grant of Philippine independence will do away with the suspicion of America's high, noble, and humanitarian purposes in the Orient.
3. It will enhance the faith of the peoples of the world in America's word.
4. It will foster mutual understanding and good will.
5. It will lessen distrust in American capital.
6. Independence of the Philippines will be the means of granting some relief to the farmers and agricultural interests.
7. The early grant of Philippine independence is the remedy to the growing labor unrest in the Western States resulting from the influx of Filipino laborers, which can not be effectively checked or regulated as long as the Philippine Islands are under the American flag.
8. It is an effective means of regulating immigration from the Philippines, for then we will be in the category of foreign countries and we can be placed upon a quota basis.
9. Philippine independence is a means of solving one of America's growing social problems made more difficult by the factor of race differences.
10. Freeing the Philippines is a way of lessening the burdens of the taxpayers of this country.
11. It will increase the confidence and friendship of the Filipinos and other orientals, and these will constitute a great moral and business asset to America in her dealings with the teeming millions in the Far East.
12. It will relieve America of the embarrassing position of recognizing ideals and principles of government at home, but, at least according to non-Americans, are not observed if not violated by the further continuation of her rule in the Philippines.
13. Granting Philippine independence will obviate the inconsistency of America fighting in the American-Spanish War for Cuba's liberation and for the Filipinos' subjugation.
14. It will be an effective method of enabling America to take the lead not only in the limitation but in actual reduction of armament.
15. The early grant of Philippine independence will be a concrete contribution of America to the cause of world understanding and international peace.

16. The establishment of a Philippine republic will be a noble Christian act of a Christian nation toward the only Christian people of the Orient. That, indeed, would be a most fitting climax to America's colonial experiment.

I submit these to the serious consideration of the American people. They have an intimate bearing upon the grant of independence to a people who have an implicit faith in America's avowal of altruistic motives; a people, Malay in origin, with a background of oriental culture and civilization; a people who to-day have a rightful claim to the oldest university under the American flag; a people who, as early as the third quarter of the nineteenth century, already had almost 2,000 schools and colleges scattered over the Philippine Islands; a people who, upon the advent of American rule, were found to have 2,160 public schools in operation and who to-day have 8,000 schools, some 30,000 teachers, and an enrollment of about 1,250,000; a people whose record of literacy is higher than that of Spain, or Mexico, or any of the South American Republics except one, or any country in the Orient except one, and a record better than that of 37 of the independent nations of the world to-day.

Again adverting to the contentions of those who are not yet quite won over to our side, let me say frankly that I do not believe the forebodings of the disciples of alarm and prophets of disaster shall come to pass. But if difficulties there will be, the Filipino people are ready and willing to take the bitter with the sweet. Among the dominant characteristics of my people are the qualities of finding joy in suffering and of deriving glory from sacrifice. If God in His wisdom should decree that the Filipinos must pay the price, we shall pay, pay it cheerfully, and consider the cost, whatever it may be, as the legitimate price of our national freedom and liberty.

THE MOTOR BUS BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, to-day I voted on the motion to recommit the motor bus bill. I went down to lunch and then misunderstood the bells announcing the roll call on passage of the bill. The roll call was completed before I returned. If I had been present, I would have voted for the bill on its final passage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. LANHAM (at the request at Mr. RAYBURN), for one week, on account of illness;

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for one week, on account of important business;

To Mr. MORGAN, for five days, on account of important business;

To Mr. CHASE (at the request of Mr. LEECH), indefinitely, on account of the serious illness of his wife;

To Mr. LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GARNER), indefinitely, on account of illness; and

To Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOLADAY), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, March 25, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider proposed legislation concerning the publication of records of the World War.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing an appropriation of defray one-half of the expenses of a joint investigation by the United States and Canada of the probable effects of proposed developments to generate electric power from the movement of the tides in Passamaquoddy and Cobscook Bays (H. J. Res. 243).

To amend an act entitled "An act to carry into effect provisions of the convention between the United States and Great Britain to regulate the level of Lake of the Woods concluded on the 24th day of February, 1925," approved May 22, 1926, as amended (H. R. 9326).

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend an act entitled "An act making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law," approved March 4, 1929 (H. R. 9724, 10673).

To amend the act of March 4, 1929, making it a felony for certain aliens to enter the United States of America (H. R. 5647).

To amend section (a) of Public Law No. 1018, Seventieth Congress (H. R. 2020).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa. (H. R. 10166).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

380. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1928 and prior years amounting to \$5,037.17, and supplemental estimate of appropriations for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931 amounting to \$3,194,690.08, in all \$3,199,727.25 (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

381. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to amend the act of May 29, 1928, pertaining to certain War Department contracts by repealing the expiration date of that act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

382. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on the Tennessee River and tributaries, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky, covering navigation, flood control, power development, and irrigation (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed as marked.

383. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the acquisition of the timber rights on Gigling Field Artillery Target Range in California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8837. A bill for the relief of the Government of China; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 4189. A bill to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WATRES: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 9500. A bill to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by the acts of June 3, 1926, and May 17, 1928, further to encourage commercial aviation by authorizing the Postmaster General to establish air mail routes; with amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REID of Illinois: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 10017. A bill to provide for a survey of the Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. OWEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 270. A joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the participation of the Government in the Sixth Pan American Child Congress, to be held at Lima, Peru, July, 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEEDY: Committee on Elections No. 1. A report on the contested-election case of Lawson v. Owen with recommendation that William C. Lawson is not entitled to a seat and that Ruth Bryan Owen is entitled to the seat from the fourth district of Florida (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 244. A joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States

of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held October 4 to October 11, 1930, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 329. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. McEvoy; without amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SIMMS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 523. A bill for the relief of Benjamin C. Lewis and Bessie Lewis, his wife; with amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Darold Brundige; with amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of Anthony Marcum; with amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6117. A bill for the relief of the Central of Georgia Railway Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lynn; without amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6663. A bill for the relief of J. N. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8591. A bill for the relief of Henry Spight; with amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8836. A bill for the relief of the French Co. of Marine and Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9123. A bill for the relief of Francis Linker; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9246. A bill to reimburse Lieut. Col. Frank J. Killilea; with amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 8249. A bill for the relief of H. W. Koch & Co. (Rept. No. 973). Laid on the table.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 8250. A bill for the relief of E. K. Lemont & Son (Rept. No. 974). Laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 601) for the relief of the trustees of Ivey Memorial Chapel, Chesterfield County, Va.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 6144) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or destroyed by fire at the naval training station, Hampton Roads, Va., on February 21, 1927; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11045) to increase the appropriation for the acquisition of a site for the new House Office Building, submitted and passed House.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11046) granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Hudson River at or near Stillwater, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 11047) to provide for the discontinuance of the use as dwellings of buildings situated in alleys in the District of Columbia, and for the replatting and

development of squares containing inhabited alleys, in the interest of public health, comfort, morals, safety, and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 11048) to provide for the commemoration of the Battles of Iuka and Eastport, in Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11049) to provide for the study, investigation, and survey for commemorative purposes of the Glorieta Pass, Pigeon Ranch, and Apache Canyon battle field in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 11050) to transfer Willacy County in the State of Texas from the Corpus Christi division of the southern district of Texas to the Brownsville division of such district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: A bill (H. R. 11051) to amend section 60 of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PRITCHARD: A bill (H. R. 11052) to confer full rights of citizenship upon the Cherokee Indians resident in the State of North Carolina and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11053) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., to the Champlain Valley Council of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 11054) amending the river and harbor act, approved March 3, 1899, for the protection and preservation of navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11055) to provide for preliminary examination and survey of Calumet River, Little Calumet River, Lake Calumet, and the Sag Channel, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11056) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed with the cleaning, pointing, painting, and repairing of all exterior stone, metal, and wood facings on the United States Customhouse Building in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11057) to amend the act entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893, as amended; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11058) to amend the act entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," approved March 1, 1893, as amended; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A resolution (H. Res. 190) to provide for the printing of certain historical statements relative to the Seven Days' Battles near Richmond, Va., June 25-July 1, 1862; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A resolution (H. Res. 191) that a special committee be appointed to inquire into the official conduct of Harry B. Anderson, United States district judge for the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 277) to refer to the Court of Claims for a report the claim of the Creek Nation of Indians for compensation for lands in Georgia and Alabama acquired by the United States under Article I of the treaty of August 9, 1814, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) making an appropriation for participation by the United States in the International Fur Trade Exhibition and Congress to be held in Leipzig, Germany, in 1930; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) for the participation of the United States in an international exposition to be held at Paris, France, in 1931; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 11059) to provide for examination and survey of the Northeast River, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADKINS: A bill (H. R. 11060) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 11061) continuing the employment of Dr. William Tindall; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11062) granting an increase of pension to Arthenchia M. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to Jane McCashen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 11064) granting a pension to Martha Eberlein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWL: A bill (H. R. 11065) granting a pension to James E. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11066) for the relief of Austin T. Larkin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11067) for the relief of the widows, fathers, and wives of certain Foreign Service officers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 11068) granting a pension to Charles G. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 11069) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Horrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 11070) for the relief of Maurice Edmund Murphy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 11071) granting a pension to Emma J. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 11072) for the relief of the Creek Nation of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 11073) to provide an appropriation for the payment of claims of persons who suffered property damage, death, or personal injury due to the explosion at the naval ammunition depot, Lake Denmark, N. J., July 10, 1926; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 11074) granting an increase of pension to Ester Haws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 11075) granting a pension to Sarah Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LARSEN: A bill (H. R. 11076) granting a pension to Julian Cecil Stanley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 11077) for the relief of Nick Gruich; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11078) for the relief of Mary Downey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 11079) granting a pension to Hattie Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11080) for the relief of Lieut. Commander E. M. Zacharias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 11081) for the relief of Mercedes Martinez Viuda de Sanchez, a Dominican subject; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11082) granting a franking privilege to Helen H. Taft; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11083) for the relief of Frank Czermak; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 11084) granting a pension to Alma A. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11085) granting a pension to Julia A. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11086) granting an increase of pension to Maggie de Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11087) granting a pension to Martha S. Wink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11088) for the refund of money erroneously collected from Thomas Griffith, of Peach Creek, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11089) granting a pension to Charlotte R. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11091) for the relief of Harvey H. Padgett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11092) for the relief of Laurence A. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5970. Petition of the agricultural steering committee of the State of South Carolina, urging the President and Congress of the United States to secure a constructive investigation of intermediate credit banks and a reconstruction of same for the conservative financing of agricultural production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5971. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., opposing the calling of an international conference by the President of the United States, or the acceptance by him of an invitation to participate in such a conference, for the purpose of revising the present calendar unless a proviso be attached thereto definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of the blank days; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5972. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the officers and members of the congregation Derech Emunch, the Derech Emunch Sisterhood, the Zionist District, and the Hadassah Chapter of Arverne, held on Sunday evening, February 23, 1930, vigorously opposing the passage of the alien registration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5973. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of 35 citizens of Sioux City, Woodbury County, Iowa, indorsing House bill 7884, prohibiting experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5974. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Racine, Wis., urging passage of a bill to provide for Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5975. Also, memorial of the city council of Janesville, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to establish Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5976. Also, memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Elkhorn, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to provide for Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5977. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Ogle H. Blair and 29 other residents of Tuscola and Huron Counties, Mich., in favor of the 3-cent rate on beans as passed by the Senate in the pending tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5978. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition signed by 42 residents of Buffalo, N. Y., urging speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5979. By Mr. DeROUEN: Petition from the farmers of Oakdale, La., and vicinity, urging restricted Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5980. By Mr. FREE: Petition of 51 residents of San Luis Obispo County, Calif., urging passage of legislation for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5981. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 38 citizens of Bonner County, Idaho, urging early enactment of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

5982. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Bellingham, Wash., urging Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5983. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Biloxi, Miss., asking for an increase in compensation paid officers and men, both active and retired, of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5984. Also, petition of chamber of commerce, Biloxi, Miss., asking for an increase in compensation paid officers and men, both active and retired, of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5985. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Sam T. Nelson and other residents of Pateros, Wash., asking for speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5986. By Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Petition urging Congress for an early passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

5987. By Mr. KORELL: Petition of residents of Portland, Oreg., favoring passage of legislation to increase pensions to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

5988. Also, petition of residents of Multnomah County, Oreg., advocating the passage of House bill 8976, for the relief of veterans, widows, and minor orphan children of veterans of Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

5989. By Mrs. LANGLEY: Petition of Willie Caldwell, Ballard Scalf, Wyatt Adkins, and 65 other citizens of Tram, Floyd

County, Ky., urging the speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rate of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

5990. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of Fred Hoge and other citizens of Geraldine, Mont., and vicinity, favoring increased rates of pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War and widows and orphans of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5991. Also, petition of Pat Kelly and other citizens of Colstrip, Mont., and vicinity, favoring increased rates of pension for veterans of the war with Spain and widows and orphans of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5992. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Hon. George T. McQuade, New York, N. Y., on behalf of persons engaged in the steamship business, bespeaking thoughtful and friendly consideration of House bill 10292, providing for an amendment of the longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5993. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of Boston and vicinity, indorsing the bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5994. By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, urging the passage of pending legislation for the relief of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5995. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the city of Industry, Ill., urging the passage of House Joint Resolution 20; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5996. By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of citizens of Gibson and Susquehanna, Pa., urging Congress to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5997. Also, petition of citizens of Sayre, Pa., urging Congress to act speedily on the Spanish War bills, H. R. 2562 and S. 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

5998. Also, petition of citizens of Thompson, Pa., urging Congress to secure early passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 to aid the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

5999. Also, petition of citizens of Honesdale, petitioning Congress to act speedily on the Spanish War bills, H. R. 2562 and S. 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6000. Also, petition of citizens of New Foundland, Pa., petitioning Congress to act speedily on the Spanish War bills, H. R. 2562 and S. 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

6001. Also, petition of citizens of Bushkill and Stroudsburg, Pa., urging Congress to support general pension bill for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6002. Also, petition of citizens of Meshoppen, Pa., urging Congress to act speedily on House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, the Spanish War bills; to the Committee on Pensions.

6003. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of residents of Baltimore, favoring passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6004. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of residents of Seattle, Wash., indorsing House bill 8976 for relief of Indian war veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6005. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition of Hon. C. H. Dean, of 1309 Thirty-eighth Street, Lincoln, Nebr., and others, urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pensions to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6006. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of Frank Durrer and 41 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging speedy consideration for Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6007. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, favoring the passage of Senate bill 941, for the protection of the black bass; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6008. By Mr. PALMER: Petition of Charles R. Harkless and 26 leading citizens of Sedalia, Mo., praying for more favorable legislation for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6009. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of residents of Macon County, Mo., asking for the speedy passage of legislation providing for more liberal pensions to the men who served in the United States armed forces during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6010. By Mr. SEGER: Resolutions adopted at meeting of all religious denominations in Paterson, N. J., March 17, 1930, protesting against antireligious persecutions in Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6011. By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Paul P. Platz and 16 others, supporting resale price bill, H. R. 11; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6012. By Mr. STONE: Petition of 212 residents of Cherokee, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233 to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6013. Also, petition of 29 residents of the town of Guthrie, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233 to prescribe a certain oath on prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6014. Also, petition of 40 residents of Carman, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233 to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6015. Also, petition of 33 residents of Hobart, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233 to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6016. Also, petition of 67 residents of Lamont, Okla., asking Congress to pass favorably on House bill 9233 to prescribe a certain prohibition oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6017. Also, petition of United States deputy marshals, urging the passage of House bill 2968 granting a pension and back pay to former United States deputy marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6018. By Mr. SWING: Petition of L. C. Beardsley and 67 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging the adoption of the Box bill to restrict Mexican immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6019. Also, petition of E. L. Pryor and 58 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6020. Also, petition of 58 citizens of Hemet, Calif., urging the adoption of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6021. Also, petition of 23 of the citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging the speedy passage of House bill 8976, for the relief of veterans and widows and minor orphan children of veterans of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

6022. By Mr. WHITLEY: Petition of citizens of Monroe County, N. Y., urging passage of House bill 2562, for relief of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

6023. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of West Chester (Pa.) Aerie, No. 1720, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, praying for the passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, to increase pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

TUESDAY, March 25, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose hand we are led, and whose Spirit in us giveth understanding, renew our minds with thoughts of spiritual refreshing borne on wings from the secret place of the Eternal, thoughts that visit only those whose hearts are purged with the constant breath of holy aspiration. Teach us to bestow our labor for that which is just and true, that in loftiness of purpose we may feel more keenly the wrongs that should be righted. Draw near us when the world oppresses, that the bondage of subjection may be loosed; abide with us when we walk with sorrow, that we may be chastened by her company.

Righteousness of God! Rise upon us like fresh ocean tides upon the strand, to our perpetual cleansing; control our wills, heal our inward obliquities, overcome in us the might of prejudice, and bind us with the cords of fellowship, that the glory of our high calling may be revealed. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930, not heretofore approved, being for the calendar days of Friday, March 14, to Monday, March 24, 1930, inclusive, when, upon request of Mr. McNARY and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented petition of members of the faculty and student body of Santa Ana College, of Santa Ana, Calif., and of the Y. M. C. A. of that college, praying for the entrance of the United States into the World Court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Oakland Forum of the California League of Women Voters, at Oakland, Calif.,